

Am Dyrhæ to John Faſt

LI G H T

Shining out of
D A R K N E S S:

O R,

Occasional Queries

S U B M I T T E D

To the Judgment of such as would
Enquire into the *True State of*
Things in our Times.

The whole Work Revised by the Author, the
Proofs Englished and Augmented, with sundry
Material Discourses concerning the *Ministry*,
Separation, *Inspiration*, *Scriptures*, *Humane Learning*,
Oaths, *Tithes*, &c.

With a Brief Apology for the *Quakers*, that
they are not Inconsistent with *Magistracy*.

By an Indifferent, but Learned Hand.

The Third Edition.

London, Printed and Sold by T: Sowle, in White-
Hart-Court in Gracious-Street, 1699.

THE
C

A R K I N S E

Occasional Addresses

To the Legislature of New Hampshire
During its Session at Concord
of 1811.

By H. C. Goldsmith Esq.

Author of "The American Slave."

and the "American Slave,"
now in its second edition.

THE
Author's Preface
TO THE
Second Edition, in 1659.

Reader,

I know not whether I injure the former Editioner, by reviewing and augmenting a Book, in which he had too great a share, that I should call it mine: Yet is it true, that most of the Queries, as to their substance, the whole Design and Preface were from me, and many of the Proofs, tho' several of the latter were inserted by him, and several, which I had put down, omitted or transposed, and that so disadvantageously, that they might seem either false or impertinent; besides that, they were imperfectly cited often, so as not to yield satisfaction to any, who had not the Books at hand.

But

The Author's Preface, &c.

But in this Edition I think the Reader will not be at any loss, but what the Printer's Errors may create him. Some Queries are wanting here, which were in the former, as that of Toleration; which, with the very same Citations, is more largely and convincingly handled in the Defence of the Good Old Cause, published by F. Stubbe of Ch. Ch. in Oxon which Treatise I must recommend to thy diligent perusal.

An Advertisement to the Reader.

This Discourse was writ by an Extraordinary Person, and has lain too long out of Print. Its Learning and Usefulness Challenge a place amongst the Best Tracts extant, where Primitive Christianity and Protestantancy have their due Credit. It's Short, but Full; and seems the Contents of those Ages in which Truth shined with so much Luster.

Read, Think, and then Judge.

Adieu.

OCCASIONAL

[3]

OCCASIONAL
QUERIES;
SUBJECTED
To the Judgment of such as would En-
quire into the true State of things in
these Our Times.

I. Whether there be any certain or peculiar Name in the New Testament that signifies a Minister? Or any Name whence an Officer may be convincingly inferred? If there be not (as there is just cause to doubt) whether the present Ministers are not to blame, while they pretend to an Office and Function grounded upon Divine Right, which hath no other Foundation, than the Hay and Stubble of Humane Conjecture?

The words used in Scripture to signify a Minister, (as they are vulgarly applied) are ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ, and ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΣ, and ΛΕΓΟΤΡΟΠΟΣ. Now none of these determinately signifies an Officer, but any one that performs such or such a Work, whether out of Duty or Charity. *Minister Executor meritis est,* say the Civil Lawyers: Διάκονος signifies either a Deacon or Church-Warden.

Act 6. or else it may be taken in as large a Sense as hath been specified, *Philem. v. 13.* *ινα νεκρος εις διακονος μας,* that he may minister to me in your stead. Was this an Office? So the Civil Magistrate is called *διακονος Θεων*, the Minister of God, *Rom. 13. 4.* and *1 Cor. 3. 9.* Who is Paul? Who is Apollo? *εκ της πλακονος δι την επιστημενην, αλλα μηνιστερος* (or Instruments) through whom you have believed. And Satan (though he be a great Imitator of Christ) is not said to have a constituted Ministry by way of Office for his Service, yet he hath Ministers, *2 Cor. 11. 15.* Satan is said to transform himself into an Angel of Light. *Οὐ μέγα τοι ει καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μεταμορφώνται εἰς διάκονους διάκονούς τους* therefore it is no great thing if his Ministers be transformed as the Ministers of Righteousness. This is not meant of any peculiar Function or Office, but a general Performance of any thing accordingly as an Officer, Servant or Minister would. In like manner is *εργαζομενος* used in that general sense: Magistrates are said to be *εργαζομενοι Θεων*, God's Ministers, *Rom. 13. 6.* And Paul saith of *Ephesians*, that he was *εργαζομενος τοις χριστιανοις*, he did minister to his wants, *Phil. 2. 25.* yet was not he his small Officer that we know. So *εργαζομενος* is taken allo, *Act 13. 5.* John was the *επιτευχης*, or Minister, or Servant of Paul and Barnabas. Yet doth it not appear that he was so by Duty, but Respect, see *Act 20. 30.* and *Act 21. 4. 23.* Is it not then probable, (and that is all that is desired at present)

sent) that there was no distinct Office, because there is no distinct Name for Ministers? And is it not evident, that such an Office cannot be proved thence, the places being equivocal, and capable of a different sense than what is usually put upon them?

The Name of Minister hath been much quarrelled at before any Civil Wars in England: Bishop Andrews was offended at it, as being a Novelism, in his Letters to du Moulin, saying, (Ep. 1.) *The Name of Minister is altogether unknown; which the Ancients would never have understood to be spoken of any but a Deacon; as it is derived indeed from no other Fountain but the Greek διάκονος.* But we must pardon you; you must speak the Language of your Church, which bath no Bishops; another kind of Presbyters [Elders they call them] another kind of Deacons; and I add, another kind of Calling than ever the Ancient Church acknowledged. [*Calling is sometimes used for the Office, for Ordination never, saith that Prelate, nor doth du Moulin deny it.*] And in his third Epistle to du Moulin, he saith, *It is strange, how it became lawful for French-men to put upon a Presbyter that name, which never any amongst the Ancients used, but for a Deacon.* I speak not this otherwise, but that even among us too, that bad Fashion is taken up, of calling them Ministers and Pastors too. But these words were brought in by them, who best relish any upstart Fashion; but against their mind who reverence Antiquity; and, as they may disclaim these Usages.

II. Supposing there were such a Name, yet would not such a Name be more general than

that of Apostles ; and comprehend not only them, but Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and all such as should labour in the Work of the Ministry of the Gospel ?

And is it not an Act of Arrogance in them who would be the Apostles Successors in ordinary, (though by the way it was something extraordinary that made an Apostle, and if that was wanting, then the Person was not an Apostle, but some other Officer : Besides, how did

Every one of the Names signifying a Minister, is attributed to the Apostles, Διάκονος and Διάκονία, *Actū 1.* 47, 25. *Actū 6. 4.* *Rom. 11. 13.* (and to Angels, *Heb. 1. 14.*) Απόστολος, *Rom. 1. 5. 16.* (and to Angels, *Heb. 1. 14.*) ὄντρικη, *Actū 26. 16* yea Paul, Apollo and Cephas, as they are called Διάκονοι, *1 Cor. 3. 5.* Who then is Paul ? and who is Apollo ? and who is Cephas ? but Ministers [διάκονοι] by whom we believed ? So likewise are they called ὄντρικαι, *1 Cor. 4. 1.* Let a Man so account of us as of the Ministers [αὐτομάται] of Christ. In fine, if there be different Ministries, as there are *1 Cor. 12. 4.* Διάκονοι Διάκονίαι. There are differences of Ministries. How come it to pass then, that there are not so now, but the name is appropriated to one ?

the Pastors, or Teachers, or Presbyters succeed them who were their Contemporaries, and never resigned up, or deserted their Stations ?) Ordinary Embassadors from the most High, to assume a Name of greater Latitude than that of Apostle or Ambassador Extraordinary ? Or at least, is it not as absurd, as if the Ant should assume the single name of Animal, and the Lacquey that of Servant ?

Not only the High-Priests among the Jews, but the Prophets and Levites, upon whom the Office of Teaching lay, were called by the Name of Pastors, *Isa. 56. 11.* *Jer. 10. 21. & 22. 22. & 23. 1, 2.* *Ezek. 34. 2.* *Zach. 10. 3.* and (saith Bishop Andrews to *du Moulin*, Ep. 3.) ' He that shall accurately con-

consider will find Princes in the State, and Magistrates often, nay oftner a great deal, to be called by the name of Pastors, than all the other put together. Yet do we not call Princes by the name of Pastors. Nor do I think, that at Geneva, he is called a Pastor who is chief Magistrate.

III. *Was not the Name of Minister brought in by the first Reformers, many whereof were Private Christians, who did assume that Title, either because they found themselves not rankable under the Name of any other Evangelical Officers; or in opposition to that Romish Hierarchy and Priesthood, whence the Modern Episcoparians and Presbyterians derive their successive Ordination?*

Whether *Martin Luther* were the first who assumed the Title of *Minister*, and gave it unto others, I am not thoroughly informed: It is not to be denied that there is mention of the *Ministry* and *Ministers*, but that was not (before his time, I think) a distinguishing name of the *Office* and *Officers*, but did express their Work; for they were called *Priests*, and were ordained by the *Papistical Bishops* amongst the *Bohemians*; but *Luther* being degraded from being a *Priest*, and an *University Doctor of Divinity*, by the *Papal Authority*, he (lest he should be destitute of a particular Appellation) assumed

*Luther ado.
falso nomin.
ord. episc.
inter. op.
edit. Wite-
berg, l. 2.
f. 306. c. 2.*

the Title of *Ecclesiastes* and *Minister of God's Word at Witeberg*. This account he gives of himself in his Book against the Order

of Bishops, falsely so called, which begins thus: ‘*Martin Luther, by the Grace of God Ecclesiastes (or Minister of the Church) at Witeberge, unto the Popish Bishops, Grace and Peace and Repentance in Christ.*

‘ *My Lords,*

‘ **I**f it seem unto you Folly, and a ridiculous Vanity in me, that I call my self by so high and magnificent a Title, as that of *Ecclesiastes* (or Minister of the Church) by the Grace of God; know that I do not wonder thereat at all. For it is no new thing for you to condemn the Gospel, to condemn the Ministers of the Word of God. Behold (that you may no longer ignore it) I call my self *Ecclesiastes* (or Minister of the Church by the Grace of God, and I have bounured my self with this Title, whom you with an Infinity of Revilings call *Heterick*, and (that you may not be ignorant thereof) I do assume unto my self that Title, out of defiance and contempt of you and Satan. And if I should name my self *Evangelist* by the Grace of God, I am sure I could sooner justifie my self therein, than you satisfie any of your being Bishops. For I am sure Christ himself doth so name me, and reputes me for an *Ecclesiastes* (or Minister of the Church) he (I say) who is the great Master of my Doctrine, and who, I doubt not, will bear me witness at the day of Judgment, that this Doctrine is not mine but God’s, and his Spirits.——

For so much as I, thorough the Wrath of
 the Pope and Emperor, am deprived of
 all my Titles, and the *Character of the Beast*,
 mentioned in the Revelation, is by several
 Bulls taken away from me, so as that I
 am no longer stiled *Doctor of Divinity*, or
 any such like Humane and Papistical Crea-
 ture. I am not much appalled at the loss
 of such Honours; for I was always a-
 shamed before God, by reason of such
Couerage and such Persons; for I was as
 you are, a Blasphemer, Hypocrite—but
 God having enlightened me thorough his
 Mercy, and revealed unto me the know-
 ledge of his Son Christ Jesus, so as that I
 should *preach the Goffel unto others*, and in-
 structed me in his ways, that I am ascer-
 tained of my Doctrines, that they are the
 pure Word of God, it did not become me to
 be destitute of a Title, whereby I should
 commend and set off the Word, and the
 Ministry thereof, unto the which I have
 been called by God, and which I have not
 received from Men, but by the Gift of God,
 and the Revelation of the Lord Christ.

To be a *Dox-*
or of Di-
ninity the
mark of the
Beast.

The like is related by *Steidam*, in his His-
 story of those Times at the Year 1522, where
 he says, that *Luther* wrote a Book against
 the Order of Bishops, falsely so called, in the
 Preface whereto, he did *assume unto himself*
the Title of Minister of the Church at *Witte-*
berge [*In Prefatione sumit sibi titulum Eccle-*
siaſtæ Wittebergensis, — *& ait cognomen bee*
Ecclesiastæ sibi imposuisse ipsum. — *& quo-*

t siam a Deo sibi demandatum sit Evangelii do-
cendi munus, aequum esse ut & ipse sibi titulum
sumat, cum falsi doctores ejusmodi fucis ad e-
se vendident. —]

IV. Whether the Name of such as officiated
in the first Centuries were not Presbyter, an Elder;
and in after-ages, Sacerdos, a Priest? And
whether that change were only of Names, or of
the Nature of their Office, through the working
of the Mystery of Iniquity, aggrandizing him-
self, and turning the Lord's Supper into an
Oblation? If the latter be true, where is Suc-
cession? How shall it be revived? Is it not in
this case, as in the Adoption of Children, where
a Lineage fails? Is it a Succession, where there
has been an Intercision and Discontinuance,
or rather a Similitude and Resemblance?

Those which officiated in the Primitive
Churches (for the Apostles, saith *Salmasius*,
under the name of *Walo Massinus*, p. 19.
are not to be reckoned amongst them: It
being inconsistent with the *Apostleship*, to fix
in any City or Province, and teach in a settled
way the People, without circuiting the World,) by
way of Ministers, were at first called
Presbyters or Elders; and afterwards, either
out of a Compliance with the Jewish Hie-
rarchy, or to allay the Objection of the Hea-
thens, that the Christians were Atheists,
having neither Priesthood, Temple, or God,
they were advanced to the Dignity of
Priests, though the reality thereot was the
product of after-times, accordingly as the opi-

opinion of the Lord's Supper, being a Sacrifice, did take root. 'The Waldenses did not own any Priesthood at all; and that justly (faith *Salmasius* or *Walo Messalinus*, p. 379. &c.) there being no such thing as Priests and Priesthood to be found in the Gospels or Apostolick Writings. Not the Apostles, nor those whom they set in the Churches to Rule, neither the one, nor the other are so called, but *Bishops* or *Presbyters*. Where there is not so much as the Name recorded, why should we imagine the Thing it self to have been. Yea, the Apostles who first of all divulged the Gospel seem to have made it their work, to abolish the Name and Memory of Jewish Sacrifices in the Places they converted? Where there were no Sacrifices, there ought to be no mention of a Priest or Priesthood. The name of *Altar* was not heard of in the Primitive Church established by the Apostles: It was a Table not Altar, whereat the Lord's Supper was celebrated and dispensed. Since therefore it is not read, that Christ, or his Disciples, who first planted the new Religion, did ascribe unto the Ministers, or Propagators thereof, the Appellation of Priest, but of Bishop and Presbyter; it is not likely that they would introduce or fix a Priesthood, however distinguished in Model from that which they went about to abolish. They were converted from being Jews, whose Laws and Ceremonies Christ did antiquate. In that Religion

Religion there were Priests, High-priests
 and Levites, whose Office and Ministry
 was so annexed to one Tribe, that it could
 not pass into another. They of other
 Tribes were called Laicks and private Per-
 sons, and were thereby distinguished from
 the Progeny of Aaron, from amongst those
 Laicks were chosen the Elders of the People,
 πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, which were together with
 the Doctors and Masters in Israel (which
 were not limited to be of a Levitical Des-
 cent) to make up the Rulers of Synagogues,
 or Assembly of the People. Now where-
 as Christ might have constituted his Dis-
 ciples according to the Jewish Model, to
 be Priests, and so to be called, as who
 were to offer up the Sacrifice of his Body;
 yet he did not do it. He made no High-
 Priests nor other Priests, whose Service he
 might use in the Propagation of the Go-
 spel. He called them Apostles, or such as
 were sent: An Appellation not unknown
 to the Jews, but given to such as being
 Ministers of Synagogues, were sent by the
 Patriarch to collect Monies from several
 Synagogues, which they were to bring
 unto him, Cod. Theod. leg. 64. de Judeis.
 The Jews term them שְׁלֵיחִים Selichim.
 That the Apostles of the Synagogues had
 under their Patriarchs such an Employ-
 ment, Epiphanius manifests in his account
 of the History of the Ebionites, where he
 speaks of one Apostle Joseph, who was
 sent into Cilicia by the Patriarch, to collect

Mark this
 for no
 Priesthood
 no Tythe.

the

the Tenth and first Fruits. By this general
 name, and which was usually attributed
 in *Judea* to such like *Messengers*, or *Mission-
 ary*, as the more modern Latinists did
 word it, sent Christ his Disciples. He called
 them *Apostles* שִׁלְחוֹת, a modest and
 humble Title. Nor would he call those
 his *Nuncio's*, or *Ministers* of the word, *Priests*.
 First, because in the new Law there was
 not any need of Sacrifices, which were
 requisite in the Old. And then again, be-
 cause that Name was too stately and mag-
 nificent, and no way agreeing with the
 condition of such as he had elected for
 Disciples, being of an inferior Rank, even
Fishers. But amongst the *Jews*, as also the
Greeks, but especially the *Jews*, the *Priest-
 hood* was an ennobling condition; so that
 only the *Priests* were the *Nobility*, the rest
 were esteemed of only as the *Commonalty*
 and private Persons. So *Josephus* in his
 Life, As amongst all other People there is
 some peculiar Character of the Nobility, so
 amongst us that of the Priesthood is received.
 Hence *Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corin-
 thians*, when he had recounted the several
 Orders or Degrees in the *Jewish Hierarchy*,
 made up of *Hgh Priests*, and other *Priests*
 and *Levites*, he terms all the rest *Laike*.
 The same *Clemens*, when he comes to speak
 of such as officiated in Christian Assem-
 blies, he calls nor them *Priests*, *Chief Priests*,
 or *Levites*, but *Deacons*, *Bishops* and *Presby-
 ters*, [διάκονος & επίσκοπος καὶ πρεσβύτερος
 nominat]

nominat.] for which Names he seeks an Original in the Old Testament, in *Isaiah*, where they are mentioned. But he did not think these Names or Employments had any affinity with the *Jewish Priesthood*. For as Christ did send his Disciples to preach unto the Nations by the Title of Apostles, a Name borrowed from the *Jewish Synagogues*, so the Apostles, in their establishing of Churches, such as they set to Rule therein, they stiled Elders or Presbyters, which Appellation they borrowed from the *Jewish Presbytery or Eldership*. As the *Jewish Synagogue* had its *Presbyters* and *Masters or Doctors*, so the Apostles placed in their Churches such an Eldership, wherein in the same should be Pastors and Teachers, to rule and instruct the People. As the *Elders and Doctors of the Jews* were *Laicks*, nor had any affinity with the *Priests* and *Levites*, so the *Christian Elders and Bishops*, being no *Priests*, had no *Sacerdotal Acts*, or *Dignity*, whereby to be distinguished from the *Laity*. The Administration of the two *Sacraments* appointed by Christ, did not render them *Priests*: For *Baptism* might of old be administered by *Deacons*, who were no *Ecclesiastical Officers*; so *Philip* baptised the *Eunuch*, and so for a long time did that Custom continue in the Church. Yea *Laymen* might Baptise in case of necessity, if no *Presbyter* or *Deacon* were present. This is evinced by an eminent passage in *Tertullian's Book of Baptism*, which runs thus;

The

' The Chief Priest or Bishop hath right to administer Baptism ; and after him, the Presbyters and Deacons ; but yet not without Authority received from the Bishop, out of regard to the Honour of the Church, which being preserved entire, things continue peaceable. Otherwise [that is, saith Pamellius, if we set aside Considerations of the Honour of the Church] even Lay-men may Baptise by right ; For that which is equally received, may be equally communicated, [of the same Judgment is Jerom] unless some Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon may be bad, since the Word of the Lord ought not to be concealed from any. Wherefore Baptism, which is equally the Treasury of the Lord, may be administered by all. [Mark this, that in his Judgment all may preach, as well as Baptise ; and that it is but Church-respect that limits them, not any Gospel Precept or Inhibition.] But how much more ought the Laicks to be modest and discreet herein, since even the greatest are prohibited to usurp the Office of a Bishop ? Emulation is the Mother of Schisms. The Holy Apostle said, all things were lawful, but not expedient. Let it suffice then, that in case of necessity you may use it, according as the Circumstances of Time, Place, and Person, require the performance. You see how it is lawful for Laicks to Baptise in case of necessity, when none in Orders are present. If this were an Act peculiar to the Priesthood, as it is a Priesthood, it could never be legitimately performed by a Laick ; it having never been lawful

lawful for a private Person to discharge
 any such Act as was properly *Sacerdotal* ;
 nor could necessity ever excuse such At-
 tempts : Which is true according to the
 Rites of the *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*. But
 a *Bishop* or *Presbyter*, yea and *Deacon* of the
 Christian Church, in that they administered
 the Sacraments of Christ, they did it not
 as *Priests*, but as *Lay men*, chosen out of
 the multitude to perform such and such
 Duties. Thus a Magistrate may do some
 things, which a private Person may not.
Baptism (saith *Tertullian*) as it is the *Tre-
sury of God*, may be administered by any body,
 But that Schism, Emulation and Disorder
 might be taken away, or prevented, some
 out of the Commonalty were elected to
 such Performances. Yet were not they
 thereupon made *Priests*, [or equivalent to
 them] nor were they reputed for such,
 after they had been created by the Apo-
 stles : For they did not propose to them-
 selves the *Jewish Priesthood* for a Pattern,
 much less that of the *Gentiles*. As the *Ma-
gistrate* is so distinguished from the *Popu-
lace*, as to be also distinct from the *Priest-
hood*, he being but a more honourable
 Member of the Multitude: Such was the
 Condition of the *Primitive Presbyters* of the
 Church, who were ordained by the Apo-
 stles. The *Eucharist* or *Lord's Supper* is
 another part of the *Treasury of the Lord*,
 that too was in process of time so ad-
 ministered particularly by the *Presbyters*, as
 they

they were Presidents in the Church, and not Priests. Of this the same may be said, which Tertullian avowed of Baptism, viz. *As it is the Treasury of the Lord, it may be diffenced by anybody; and indeed so it was in its first Institution: And afterwards, when that Custom was altered, if the Presbyters were absent, Lay-men did distribute it, and consecrate it, and that lawfully.* Hence in the first Ages, according to the original Prescript, it was celebrated after Supper, and that too by each Master of the Family in his House. Tertullian records it amorgst such Rites as had been introduced by a Deviation from Primitive Constitutions, that in his time they received the Sacrament from the hands of the Presbyters or Presidents. In his Book *De Corona*, he saith, *The Sacrement of the Eucharist being enjoyed at Supper-time, and unto all, by the Lord; even in our Assemblies before day-break, do we receive, and that from no other hand than the Presidents.* In the African Church, that there might continue some Memorials of the Ancient Practice, anniversarily on a certain day after Supper, they did communicate, and did in reality celebrate the Lord's Supper. In many places of Egypt, saith Sozomen, they assembled together on the Sabbath in the Church, and did partake of the Lord's Supper, Περὶ Ἀργυρίου εἰ τολλας πόλεσι καὶ καμάται, ταῦτα τῷ κοινῷ ταῖς νεομάρτυροι, πρὸς αὐτούριν τοῦ σαββάτου εὐηγγέλισαντες ἡμῖν τὸν μυστήριον μετέχοντες. In several

*Cod. Afric.
Can. 41.*

several Towns and Villages of the Egyptians,
 contrary to the Custom generally received, in
 the Evening of the Sabbath, they having supped
 already [so *Salmasius* renders it, *jam canati*] 16
 assemble and receive the Sacrament. The
 Laicks did also consecrate and dispence it
 to themselves, if the Presbyter or Presi-
 dent were not in the way. Of this we
 have a pregnant Testimony in *Tertullian's*
Exhortation to his Wife, which is basely cor-
 rupted in former Editions: Are not we of
 the Laity Priests? It is written, He hath made
 us Kings and Priests to God and his Father.
 The difference betwixt Pastors and People [*in-*
ter ordinem & plebem] is but a Constitution
 of the Church, not of any higher authoritative
 Appointment, and an Honour which owes its
 Sanctity to the Ecclesiastical Session. Where-
 fore if there be no Ecclesiastical Order, you
 Baptise, you Communicate, and you are a Priest
 unto your self alone. But where there are Three,
 there is a Church, though of Lay-men. Yea,
 the Name of Church is attributed to the
 Assembly of the Faithful, as contra-distinct
 to their Pastors, even in the Acts of the
 Apostles, and the Constitutions of the
 Pseudo-Clemens. In Church-polity the Pres-
 byters and Laity [*ordo & plebs*] were so di-
 stinguish'd, as in the Civil Government of
 the Gentiles were [*ordo & plebs*] the Senate
 and People. And this distinction betwixt
 the Governours and Governed, [*inter ordi-*
 nem Ecclesiasticum & plebem] was not, in
 the Judgment of *Tertullian*, of Divine In-
 strution,

stitution, but the Appointment of the
 Church. The same Writer (as well as
 Ambrose, Jerom and Austin) in the fore-
 mentioned passage out of his Book of Bap-
 tism, avoweth that it was from the same
 reason that Bishops came to be superior to
 Presbyters, *propter Ecclesiæ bonorem; quo*
salvo, salva pax est. Thus it is his Judg-
 ment [who was one of the most Learned,
 as well as Ancient Fathers] that the whole
 Ecclesiastical Order was a thing not of
 Divine, but Humane Constitution. But
 however the Order of Clergy and Laity
 (for the Greek Councils term the Laity
 an Order) are not so distinct as Priests
 and People, but as Prefects or Rulers, and
 those that are under Government. Doth
 Ordination, that is, Imposition of Hands,
 by which they are ordained, or ranked in
 order [*in ordinem co-optantur*] make them
 Priests? No, not at all, let them talk
 what they will of a Sacrament of Order;
 neither do they which confer it, confer
 it as Priests, nor are the Receivers by ver-
 tue of such Collation made Priests. There
 is not any Sacrament of Christ, the Admi-
 nistration whereof doth qualifie a Priest,
 because Christ instituted no *Priesthood*, nor
 did he constitute them *Priests* with whom
 he intrusted his Church. He ordained
Apostles, and denominated them so from
 their being sent. The *Apostles* did after-
 wards ordain *Presbyters* or *Bishops* to rule
 and instruct the People. There was no

‘ need of Priests to perform the Sacred Rites
 ‘ and Solemnities, after the Jewish Sacrifices
 ‘ are abolished, and those of the Gentiles dis-
 ‘ used. Ordination is the Act it self, where-
 ‘ by thorough certain Ceremonies and Rites,
 ‘ one is chosen and elected into an Order
 ‘ [ordinem] to be a Member of that Order,
 ‘ Body or Colledge into which he is chosen.
 ‘ An Order [ordo] is a certain number of
 ‘ Men which make up one Body or Colledge,
 ‘ each one obtaining place in the said Body
 ‘ accordingly as he was admitted ; he who
 ‘ was first chosen, being the first; who second,
 ‘ second ; and who last, being last. Hence
 ‘ came the Appellation of Order [Ordo].
 ‘ Nor is there any Body, Colledge or So-
 ‘ ciety, which may not upon this account
 ‘ be termed an Order, [Ordo] or hath not
 ‘ been so. But sometimes by way of Emi-
 ‘ gence, *et i^o xxv*, the principal Order or
 ‘ Colledge in the Republick, or City, was
 ‘ styled the Senatorian Order, and so distin-
 ‘ guished from the People. Thus in the
 ‘ Church, the Senate or Colledge of Presbyters,
 ‘ amongst whom the Bishop did preside, was
 ‘ termed an Order, or the Order, as appears
 ‘ by that passage of Tertullian already cited,
 ‘ *inter ordinem & plebem*. Otherwise all the
 ‘ Bishops made up their own Order, after that
 ‘ they became distinct and superior to the
 ‘ Presbyters : The Presbyters they constituted
 ‘ the second Order : The Deacons they did
 ‘ also make up their Order ; and so forth,
 ‘ even to the Door-keepers. The People had
 ‘ their

their distinct Order from these other Ecclesiastical ones, they being one Body, and frequently styled in the Greek Councils, the *Lay-order*, οἱ τάγματα. The Prophets, whilst they lived in the Primitive Times, they made up the Prophetical Order, whereof mention is found in *Ruffinus*. From what hath been said, it is manifest to every one, how besotted they were, who from Ordination introduced a *Sacrament of Order*, or *Orders*; whence proceeded those foolish and ridiculous Forms of Speech, *To take or enter into Orders*; Expressions not to be found in purer Times, when Men were said to be chosen, or admitted into the Order, or the like, at such time as they were Ordained, that is, admitted to a place in this or that Order. Now all Ordinations, Civil or Ecclesiastical, amongst Jews and Heathens, were performed with certain Rites and Ceremonies: The Christians did derive theirs, which they used at the Ordination of *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, from the Jews: For they did ordain the *Elders* or *Presbyters* of their Synagogue, and the *Doctors* of their Law, by Imposition of Hands, which was called סמיכה Semicha, that is, *χειροτονία*, laying on of Hands. This in the Old and New Testament, was used for the conferring of the Holy Ghost: *Imposition of Hands* was likewise used for the promoting Men to the Degree of *Rabbines* or *Doctors*: And at the Collation of Juridical Power. From hence sprang that

Custom in the Church of Christ, that
 when any were designed to any publick
 Ministry or Magistry in the Church, they
 were so designed by this Jewish Semicha,
 or *Imposition of Hands*. And this Imposi-
 tion of Hands, howbeit it were of Divine
 Right; yet such as were designed to a pu-
 blick Magistry or Ministry, to teach, rule,
 or serve in the Church, were not there-
 upon made Priests. In fury it was per-
 formed by Three. In Codice Sanedrin, Cap. i.
 סמיכת וקנין it is rendered χειροτονία
 τρισυρίων, the laying on of Hands of the El-
 ders, and is said to be performed by Three.
 From whence it is, that in the Apostolick
 Canons and Constitutions of Clement, it is
 appointed that a Bishop be ordained by
 Three. But the fourth Canon of the first
 Synod doth enact, that a Bishop be or-
 dained at least by Three, if all the other
 Bishops of the Province cannot be present.
 It is called in Codice Sanedrin, Επιδίωσις
 χειρῶν ἢν πρεσβυτηρίων, or the laying on of the
 Hands of the Elders. Paul, 1 Tim. 4. 14 calls
 it, επιδίωσις ἢν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου, the lay-
 ing on of the Hands of the Presbytery, or Elder-
 ship, which is all one. Since therefore that
 solemn *Imposition of Hands* among the Jews,
 when they created the Elders of the Syna-
 gogue, or Doctors, did not make them
 Priests, but only gave them Authority to
 Judge and Teach the People: So neither
 did the *Laying on of Hands*, which out of
 Imitation of them was used among the

Christians,

Christians, to create Presbyters and Teachers,
 imprint on them a Sacerdotal Character.
 Even in the Old Testament, as well as New,
 the Holy Ghost was conferred by Imposi-
 tion of Hands: Thus Joshua the Son of
 Nun was filled with the Holy Ghost, after
 Moses had laid his Hands on him, Deut. 34.9.
 And other Examples there are in Scrip-
 ture. The Name of Priest, as it was ascri-
 bed to the Christian Presbyters, and that of
 Chief Priests, to be distinct from the Laity,
 was introduced in the second Century,
 and in the Age after the Apostles. For
 when many came over from Heathenism
 to Christianity, and several of the Jews
 were converted, both of which, in the Re-
 ligion which they deserted, had been in-
 ued to Priests and Chief Priests; it was easie
 for them so to accommodate things, that
 in their newly-embraced Religion they
 should either find or create Priests, espe-
 cially in Name. And indeed they did ra-
 ther create them, for there were none at
 first amongst the Christians. Nor was this
 change of Names opposed by such as re-
 ceived the Converts, that so they might
 gain more and more upon the Jews and
 Gentiles, chiefly seeing the whole Contro-
 versie seemed to be but a Word or Name-
 quarrel. They did little think that such
 temporizing and compliance in words,
 would at last beget an Alteration in the
 things themselves. That which they then
 called a Sacrifice, was not esteemed of as a

real and propitiatory one: Whom they
 called *Priests*, then were not reputed truly
 such, nor of a resembling Appointment
 to what was amongst the *Jews*. What
 they called *Altars*, were not deemed pa-
 rallel to what the Heathenish Rites and
 Sacrifices were performed at. In a word,
 after some space of time, as all things de-
 generate, so Men in the Christian Church
 began to think of real Altars, real Sacri-
 fices, real Priests, no less than the *Jews* or
Heathens. Thereupon the Imposition of
 Hands, whereby they were ordained
 Priests, was held as a great *Sacrament*. The
 Priests began so to be distinguished from
 the *Laicks*, as the Priests and *Commonalty*
 amongst the *Jews*. In the Time of Cle-
 ment, this distinction betwixt the Sacer-
 dotal Order and Laity, was not intro-
 duced among Christians, being a distinction
 purely Jewish. He tells them at *Corinth*,
 that the Apostles did constitute in the
 Church *Bishops* and *Deacons*, and that not
 by any very extraordinary Dispensation,
 it having been long foretold in Scrip-
 ture, *κατασκον τε πριερεών είναι μόνη οὐδείς στάχυος αὐτούς είναι μητέρι*. I will appoint their
 Bishops in Justice, and their Ministers in
 Faith. If there had been any resemblance
 betwixt the Christian Bishops, and those
 of the *Jews*, he would have had re-
 course to the Jewish *Hierarchy*, and not
 to those Bishops and Ministers in *Isaiah*,
 that had no affinity with the former.

The

The Bishops and Presbyters in those days
 were so far Laicks, as to be esteemed only
 the more honourable part of the People:
 And therefore it was, that several Lay-
 men were chosen to be Presbyters and
 Bishops, without being promoted gradu-
 ally thorough the inferior Orders. And
 that Custom did continue long in the
 Church. Thus Ambrose at Millain, Necta-
 rius at Constantinople, and some-body else
 in Syria, all which had been civilly em-
 ployed. And it is evident out of Leo's
 Epistle, that this was the Custom in sev-
 eral places of Italy, which he went about
 to abolish.—These things being so (saith
 Salmasius to Petavius) why do you cen-
 sure Luther and the Waldenses, because
 they denied all manner of Priesthood, be-
 lieving, that an honest believing Lay-
 man might perform all those things and
 Ecclesiastical Duties in the Church of
 God, having been empowered thereunto
 by Imposition of Hands from the Pres-
 bytery, that is a Lay-call and not Eccle-
 siastical Senate? Certainly Peter, by whose
 Authority he proved his Assertion, did
 say that all Lay-men were Priests: And
 styles the Christians universally (all that are
 to be living Stones in Christ) a Royal and
 Holy Priesthood.

See what the
 Judgment of
 Luther was
 hereafter.

From all this that hath been said by the
 most learned Salmasius (though even Bellar-
 mine himself confessed that such as served
 Christ in the Ministry of the Gospel amongst

the first Christians, were not of a long time called *Priests*, but *Presbyters*) it is evident that there was a change of Names, and that the aforesaid change of Names did introduce a change in the substantial part of their *Function*; they who at first were looked upon only as *Lay-men*, maintained by the free contribution of the Believers, whose Office was merely a *procuration*, not a *Dignity*, *Magistracy*, or *Authority*, or *Power* (as *Salmasius* proves at large throughout the sixth chapter of *Walo Messalinus*: As also doth the well-read Bishop of *Spalato*, where he deprives them of all *Jurisdiction*) these afterwards became, as well as were termed, *Priests*, as were Aaron and his Sons, together with the Levites amongst the Jews in the Temple; such were, and the same quality did the Bishops, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* challenge in the Church: Yea after-times gave them their *Courts* and *Apparitours*. Tithes became claimed and granted upon a *Divine Right*, and they who before were the Peoples *Creatures*, such as they did *Eleet*, and could Depose or *Excommunicate*, and who could perform no *Church-act* without them, their employment being to oversee, not in a

Compulsive, but Voluntary Way, 1 Pet. 5. 2. *Dignity*, *Authority*, *Magisterial Power*, were so much insisted on, as if he that desired a *Bishoprick*, had not desired a *Work*, a *good Work*; but an office with *Jurisdiction*:

Petrus omnem jurisdictionem adimit Episcopis, ubi officium eorum vult esse, et inveniatur. ex auctoritate, et iurisdictione, hoc sit ualentibus praecipiendo quod eis cenducat, et consulendo, non iubendo quod liberas imperant, nec cogendo nolentes. Jurisdictionis omnis auctoritas est. yvalo Messalin. c. 6. p. 460.

Jurisdiction: And the People were totally deprived in their right in the Governance of the Church. After that things have continued in this posture 1400 Years, for Men to start up, and without any new Power collated on them, to pretend to re-establish the primitive Presbytery, is such an attempt as could not enter into the thoughts of considering Men. There may be a resemblance betwixt the *Altar at Damascus* and that at *Jerusalem*, but they are not the same. The example of the *Levites in Israel*, if they reform from Idolatry, avails not here; because the Priesthood to them was a *Birth-right*, and did not depend upon Institution: The Descendants of *Aaron*, though consecrated Priests to *Moloch or Baal*, did not cease to be *Levites*; but it is not so with *Presbyters*: Or, suppose it were so with them who had been once *rightly* constituted, What is that to them who never were so? Can they give a power which they never had? Can they exercise a power which they never receiv'd? If out of Scripture it be proved that *Mass Priests should be Presbyters*; out of their *Officialls* it is clear that they are not so: And consequently, in order to the *discharge* of such a Function, they are private Persons: And if they who ordained them were such, the Ordained could receive no other Institution than to be the *equivocating Generation of equivoical Parents*. But if we must have *primitive Presbyters*, what means the claim for *Jurisdiction*? Where is the power of the People

People to Elect? Where is their voluntary Maintenance? What

Brevis against Serapis (animadver.
An. c. II.) at the name of the Clergy
cryeth out, *Quare istum in Ecclesiis
reformatis Clerus nunc esse definitus
est? Nam aliquam sororitatem turbam,
qui ex Papistis illius Cleri, ac prae-
fertim ex Sacrificatorum, quis falso
nomine Presbyteros appellant, sentia
emiserint?* VVhom shall we
call the Clergy among the reformed
Churches? Is it that Rabble-rot
which came over from that Popish
Clergy, and the number of those
Priests who are falsely termed Presby-
ters?

Ch. 44 v. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. The Levites (who were such by Birth, and not personal appointment) that are gone away far from me, when Israel went astray, which went astray after their Idols, they shall even bear their Iniquity. Yet they shall be Ministers in my Sanctuary, having charge at the Gates of the House, and ministering to the House: They shall slay the Burnt-offering, and the Sacrifice for the People, and they shall stand before them to minister unto them. Because they ministered unto them before their Idols, and caused the House of Israel to fall into Iniquity: Therefore have I lifted up mine hand against them, saith the Lord God, and they shall bear their Iniquity. And they shall not come near unto me to do the office of a Priest unto me, nor to come near unto any of my Holy Things, in the most Holy Place: But they shall bear their Shame, and their Abominations which they have committed. But I will make them keepers of the charge of the House for all the service

vice thereof, and for all that shall be done therein. But the Priests, the Levites, the Sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my Sanctuary, when the Children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me, and they shall stand before me, to offer unto me the Fat, and the Blood, saith the Lord God. They shall enter into my Sanctuary, and they shall come near to my Table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge. Conformable hereunto was the practise of good Josiah, 2 Kings 23. v. 9. After that he had extirpated Idolatry, and re-established the worship of God. The Priests of the High-places (notwithstanding what of pleasure our Ministers suggests for them, and whereof Josiah could not be ignorant) they came not up to the Altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread amongst their Brethren.

Though, setting aside this last consideration, I never think of the Ordination by laying on of bands insignificantly, continued now amongst the Presbyterians and Episcoparians, but I remember a passage of Mourtaine about Titus, c. 3. p. 438. How Hercules was enfranchised amongst the Gods, and born by Juno again, as Diodore relateth (in some such sort, as amongst us, the Children of John of Gaunt by Katharine Swinford, are said to have been made legitimate by Act of Parliament) by a solemn ceremony, he coming from under Juno's Clothes.

V. Whether the present Ministry (supposing them to be generally Presbyterians or Episcoparians) do not pretend to be Ministers of the Church Catholick ? Whether there be any mention of such a Church in Scripture, or in any Ancient Creed of the first Ages ? And whether Luther did not place instead thereof, in his Creed, the Christian Church ? Whether any body can tell what is the determinate meaning of that word ? Whether the Ordainers and Ordained now a-days deal conscientiously in giving or receiving, and acting really by vertue of a power from, and over the Catholick Church, whilst the existence and signification thereof is so controverted amongst themselves and others ?

To say nothing of the *Episcopal Divines*, that the most insupportable *Presbyterian* makes this to be his claim, it is evident not only from Dr. John Wallis (Sub-Scribe in the *Westminster Assembly*) in his *Thesis* of the power of a Minister out of his particular Congregation : But also from the Contest betwixt the *Independent Ministers* of *Suffolk*, and Dr. Collins of *Norwich*, and Mr. Pool of *London*, who writes at the appointment of the provincial *Assembly* there, in whose late Books, against each other, this Question is largely debated concerning *Ministers* being proximately related to a *Catholick Church*, and with great advantage on the side of the Congregational Men in *Suffolk*. That there is no mention of a *Catholick Church* in Scripture, it is clear, no Concordance hitherto could shew it : And it is very strange that

the

the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures (which are able to make the Man of God perfect unto every good Word, no less than Work) should not once mention this visible Catholick Church, neither directly, nor by any equipollent Terms: That in the good thing which was committed unto *Timothy*, and in ^{2 Tim. 3.}
^{16, 17.} that Form of sound words which he had heard from *Paul*, and which he was to hold fast, there should not be any slight Intimation or Record thereof, renders its Existence very suspicious: Especially *Timothy* (according to the Fancy of the Presbyterians) being a Minister, and consequently participating of this Delegacy over the Catholick Church, and his immediate and most considerable Relation being thereunto, the Station he held in *Crete* being only Secondary: That *Paul* should tell the Elders of the Church at *Ephesus*, that *he had kept back nothing which was profitable unto them*; That *he had not shunned to declare unto them all the Counsel of God*, and yet should only bid them *take heed unto themselves, and to all the Flock* (not throughout the World, but at *Ephesus*) *over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he had purchased with his Blood*: All which the ensuing words evince to appertain to the particular Church of *Ephesus*, whereof (and not of the Catholick Church) they are called Elders, v. 17.) This creates in me an Apprehension that this Catholick Church, and Catholick-Church-Ministry, is neither a part of the
 Counsel

Counsel of God, nor profitable to be known. That it is as little to be found in the ancient Creeds as in the Scripture, you may not only learn from Bishop Usher in his Treatise of the Creeds, p. 8, 9, 12. in several Copies, but more fully from *Vossius* in his Discourse of the Three Creeds, p. 27. §. 39. ‘The Aquilegian Creed hath not the word Catholick, yet it is added thereto in the Edition of *Pamelius*--but wrongfully, for the ancientest Books read it otherwise. And if *Ruffinus* had owned it, he had explained it, for it is not a passage of slight moment. But what wonder is it if it be not in *Ruffinus*, seeing *Austin* had it not? Who in his Explanation of the Creed, when he comes to the passage of *Holy Church*, he adds for Illustration sake, *To wit, the Catbolick*. And that is understood by *Holy*, there being none *Holy*, but the *Catbolick*. Nay in the Apostles time it was not the Custom for Christians to be called *Catbolicks*: As *Pacianus* wrote it in a Letter to *Symporianus*, who lived in the time of *Jerom*. Whence [our English] *Whistaker*, in his Book of the Church, did collect, that the Appellation of the *Catbolick Church*, was not used in the Apostolical times. Yea, and *Franciscus Picus* did think that the Clause of the *Church Catbolick* was introduced after the *Nicene Creed*, by way of opposition to the *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*: Who, whatever Truth they held, did not possess (or were made to believe so) that *Universality*

sality of Mankind, whereunto the others pretended. *Luther* is charged by the Par-

gists to have placed instead thereof the word *Christian*, in his little *Catechism*, fol. 12. and in the great *Catechism*, fol. 64. as it is in the *Body of the Doctrine of the Seven Churches*, published by

John William Duke of Saxony at Jenq 1570. the *Heirs of Christian*

Rodinger printing it. Repeating it *Eine Heilige Christliche Kirche*. Nor is this said to have been denied by *Chemnitius*, in *Gerard's Common places of Divinity*, but that he replied to that Accusation, how *Luther* was not the first who made that Variation, but that before his time the *German Creed* had it usually *Ich glaube eine heilige Christliche Kirche*, *I believe one Holy Church*.

As for the signification or meaning of the word, it is very ambiguous. Three principal Grounds are given, why the Church should be termed *Universal* or *Catholic*: First, From its *Universality of place*, it being diffused throughout the whole Earth. Secondly, From its *Universality of Duration*, it being to continue unto the end of the World. Thirdly, From the *Universality of Persons* thereunto appertaining, of all Sexes, Ages and Conditions. Other less material grounds, are from its being *Universally known*, from the *Universal Learning* that is professed

It is acknowledged that *Luther* could not endure the Name of *Catholic*, in so much as if that word were found in his *Writings* with Approbation, the Book or Passage was therewith suspected by his Scholars, as not being his. See *Quaest. Altenberg.* in resp. ad accus. Cor. 2. fol. 254. as *Brevery* in his *Peccatants Apology* doth cite it.

Balib-Melif.
seri de Es-
clos. p. 314.
Gerard. loc.
Theolog. in
fol. 1. 5. de
Ecclesia. c. 4.
Sect. 34.

professed thereby, respecting God and the Creatures, things visible and invisible. From the Universality of its Spiritual Care, as to all manner of Sins. And lastly, From its respective Universality, in regard of the Jews and Heretics; the former being restrained to Palestine, and the latter being never likely to grow so numerous, but that the *true Church* shall exceed them, though not in regard of some particular Country, yet in respect of the whole World. The Universality of the Church upon the Papistical grounds aforesaid, is audited by *Balthasar Maisnerus*, in his Book of the Church, Sect. 4. c. 3. whether I remit the Reader, being loth to trouble my self with idle Enquiries. I only observe, that since words do not signify naturally, but by the Institution of Man, in whose Language God is pleased to deliver himself: Since we cannot know what the meaning and intent of him or they was, who first imposed that Name, (which it is evident we cannot, it being not known who introduced it, or when it began to be used) all that we can do, is to know how this Appellation of Humane Original, if it must be retained, may be verified. The general meaning of the first Reformers was, That

Luther de abrog. miss. privat. inter ep. Wittemberg. 1. 2. f.

the Catholick Church of Christ was made up of his Elect, that had been, were, or should be, to the end of the World. Hence Luther saith, the Holy Church in the Creed is invisible, and hid in the Spirit, and only believed, not seen. So the Learned and

Judicious

Judicious Sædeel against Turrianus's Sophisms

(p. 566; Oper. in fol.) 'We, by the Name
of one Catholick Church, understand the
Invisible Church of the Elect, whose Head is
Christ; and we presume upon certain &c.

*Vide Sibr.
dum Luber-
tum de Ec-
clesia, l. 2.
c. 6. p. 82.*

Testimonies in Scripture, Colos. 1. Ephes. 4
and 5, &c. And, if we will speak pro-
perly, then will the Church Catholick be
compleat, when Christ shall come to judge
the Quick and the Dead.— And in his

Animadversions upon the Articles of the
Monks of Bourdeaux; he saith, The Catholick
Church consists only of the Faithful and
Elect, and that it is Invisible, as compre-
hending the Saints in Heaven. For do not
they belong to the Catholick Church? If
so, then you must either make two Catho-
lick Churches (contrary to the Nicene Creed,
of one Catholick and Apostolick Church) one Vi-
sible, the other Invisible; or confess that that
which is one, is invisible. He tells us there,
and elsewhere, that particular Churches are
one only by Religion, and Profession of the
same Doctrine, they are otherwise Indivi-
duals, of which the Name of Church is pre-
dicted, as the Church of Corinth, Ephesus,
Philippi, &c. These, he saith, are visible
Churches, because they retain the exterior
Order and Face of Churches; they are
made up of Believers and Unbelievers, and
are called Churches of Christ, only from the
mixture of the Elect, and their Profession of
him. In the Controversie, now in England
on foot, besides the terming the Christian
Church,

*Anton. Se-
deel, p. 523.*

Church, Catbolick, in opposition to the *Jewish Church*, which was confined to *Palestine*, whilst this may subsist any where. (In which signification *Catholicism* may be attributed to *Paganism* or *Mahometanism*; and *Christian Catholicism* to any Church, *Socinian*, *Popish*, *Anabaptistical*, or otherwise opinionated, professing *Christ*, in a way which they do avow for Truth, though others call it *Heresie*) or taking it for the *Universality* of *Christians* scattered over the face of the whole Earth (in which sense *Catbolick* is *terminus minuens*, or a term which overthrows the subject upon which it is predicated; for since a *Church* is, by general acknowledgment, a *Congregation of Men thus and thus regulated*; a *Catbolick Church*, in the Sence specified, is *no Church*, but one that is scattered and unchurched; and a *Minister* of such a *Church*, would be like a *Jew* in *Amsterden*, who should pretend to be, or ordain an Officer for the *Ten Tribes*, carried into Captivity no body knows where. Besides these Acceptations, there are two more commonly insisted on; *The one*, that the *Catbolick Church* is an universal Term in *Logick*, and the *Ministers* are *Ministers* of such a *Church*. This is the Judgment of Dr. *Collins* of *Norwich*, in his Discourse of the *Ministry*, as it is reported by his *Antagonists* of *Suffolk*, in the Defence of their Preface to the *Preacher Sent.* But as this is denied and refuted by them very well, so it is rejected by Mr. *Hudson*, a *Presbyterian*, as they likewise

likewise say. However it is Non-sence: For if the Church be such an Universal, and such Universals do only subsist in Particulars, (being, *aut nihil, aut quid posterius*) the *Presbyterians* do very ill to ordain Ministers of an Universal Church, that they may be after preferred to Particular ones, for they ought rather to ordain Ministers of Particular Churches, that so they might be found within the compass of the Imaginary Universality, which is either nothing but a word (and so they only Nominal Ministers) or else only an Essential Similitude or Resemblance betwixt one Church Particular and another; and so they who are no Ministers of a Particular Church, participate not of this Catholicism: And likewise they who are Ministers of such a Particular Church, have no power beyond that Church, by vertue of their Ministry, which is not Catholick, though their Churches be. Another acception of the word amongst us, is, That the severall Churches professing Christ, make up one Body of Christ, of which he is Head, and they his Stewards, actually confined to one Church, but authoritatively designed to all: So that every Presbyterian Minister is by his Ordination constituted a Pope, an Universal Ministerial Head of the Church, by way of Divine Mission; but by way of Prudential and Humane Condescension, they are content to admit of a Government shut up within Parochial Precincts. But if this be so, if by vertue of

that Delegation, *As the Father sent me, so send I you*; they have so universal a Mission every one to the whole Body of Christ, I do not see how in Conscience they can sit down with these narrow Boundaries (they being able to extend their Preaching further, as often as the usual Allotments do not afford sufficient Maintenance for their Luxury; which is visible in their Pluralities, and Incorporations of Parishes) since Christ seems to argue them into another Practise, *Luke 4. 42, 43, 44. And when it was day he departed, and went into a desert place: And the People sought him, and came unto him and stayed him, that he should not depart from them. And he said unto them, I MUST preach the Kingdom of God to OTHER Cities also: for THEREFORE am I sent. And he preached in the Synagogues of Galilee.* But to proceed: It is evident that all this Plea is meer Cousenage: For first, It is not imaginable what Union intercedes betwixt the several Churches professing Christ upon the face of the Earth: It is not known how far there is a Doctrinal Union or Consent among them, and if it were, yet would not that render them one visible Body, no more than the Book of the *Harmony of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches*, doth embody them; for Identity of Laws, or way of living, doth not make two Republicks to be one; since Norimberg in Germany is said to have sent to Valenciennes in Flanders, and to have derived its Platform of Government thence;

thence; yet did not it thereby incorporate it self with *Valencianites*, no more than Rome became a part of *Graeca*, when they settid thence their Laws of the *Twelve Tables*: So several Colledges vpon *Okon*, have the same Statutes and Form of Government, yet do they not thereby become one Colledge: Nor in any of these cases is it said, that the Officers chosen here, or there, are Universal Officers, or Officers to the several Parties Assembling: A common Meeting of all Christians at the Throne of Grace, is as weak a Proof to the effecting of an Union, as of a Visibility all: For he who shall consider (not only that this is an invisible Meeting, and only of the Elect) the Expression is warrancable from Scripture; but) that in the difference of Climates, varying accordingly Nights and Days and times of Worship, it is impossible there should be any joyn Meeting at the Throne of Grace, of these several Churches in several Situations, will never grant such parcel Meetings to be an universal Assembly; much less that this is the Act of an Organical Body; it not being done by any mutual Entercourse, Correspondence, or Appointment, nor knowl-edge of each other: Now it is certain, that in an Organical (or indeed any Integral) Body, the Parts have no determinate par-ticular Acts of their own; no part doth this, or that, but the whole doth this or that by the part, *Actiones sunt Suppositorum*. And when any part is in such a Condition, that

its own *Archiesus* (as I may call it) doth form its Operation; then it is but equivocally a part, no though joyned to the whole by Colligation, as in a rotten Bough, or gangrened Leg. In a word, since the Universal Church pretended, hath no Officers acting in an Universal way, nor is visible in it self by any Universal Actings, I leave these conceited Ministers of an ideated Church, to perswade us (for there is as good reason) that all the Kingdoms of the Earth are one Universal Kingdom, and that the Kings of Spain, France, &c. are Primarily Kings (or what name else they will afford them) of the Universal Kingdom, and Secondarily of the Kingdoms specified. He that will further enquire into this Controversie, may satisfie himself in the *Suffolk Ministers Preacher Sent*, and their late Defence thereof. But it is further considerable, that all particular Churches are only Churches of Christ by Profession, not by any relation to him, as *Spouse, Flock, or Body*: These are Assemblies of a mix'd Nature, Fields in which the Tares grow up with the Corn, Bodies wherin corrupt (however disguised) Humours and Excrements are contained, and some whereof shall never have any part in that Church which is (according to God's Predestination and Intent) without Spot, and without Wrinkle. Their Combination or right of Assembling, is founded in Nature, not any new command of Christ, and hath no other rise than

than the Heathen Worship had ; Examples are no Institutions ; and those general Precepts , of doing all things according to Order, Decency, for the Glory of God, and Edification of others, these are but the Dictates of Nature transcribed into the written Word of God. For if it were otherwise (to pass by the Arguments used by the Reformed Divines against Bellarmine) ; that the Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, consists only of the Predestinate) however conjugal Relations, or the like, should not multiply in Christ, yet would it be undeniable that such a number of particular Churches would increase to a multitude of Spouses, Bodies, &c. Yet doth the Scripture never mention more Mystical Bodies, &c. than one, though many Churches be mentioned, as Corinth, Ephesus, and those others in Asia.

Vid. Sibrand.
Lubbert. de
Ecccl. l. 2. c. 6.
p. 82. &c.

VI. Whether Ecclesia (which is a word signifying a Church) be not a Law-term deduced from Free-States, in which Common-wealths the supreme popular Assembly acted and organised by the Archon and Proedri (as a Church form'd and Presbyterated by a Minister and Elders) which did not Rule but Preside ? (a) Whether any other sense but that, can be a Foundation of Argument ? since no Term can be the subject of a rational Discourse, whose meaning is not agreed on ; but of a figurative Speech, no Man (none but the Spirit that gave it out at first) can determine satisfactorily to

others, how far the Analogy extends; how far the Coras may be stretched, and what is the just and full Scope of the Holy Spirit there.

(4) This is so evident, that he must not have conversed in any Greek Story, who denies it. They who have not read *Thucydides*, nor *Aristophanes*, may satish themselves about it out of *Sisypus de Rep. Athenarum*, and *Ubo Ennius deus Gratia*. *Ubi Cuncti*, which is the *Witnichesi Poem Stratæ*.

VII. Whether such a Sense of the Word Ecclesia, or Church, doth not Un-Church all the Parochial Churches in England, and Un-Minister all their Ministers?

As for the Unchurching the Parochial Churches, it is no such strange thing, the Independents have done it over and over, particularly Dr. Owen in his Book of *Sabbatism*, where he sheweth them to be of *Humane Institution*, and calls (if we may believe Mr. Gaudrey) their Ministers, Parish Priests: He overthroweth their Succession, as it is derived from or thorough the Papacy, and acknowledgeth them to be Ministers of Christ upon another account only, than they will own, viz. The Call of some of their Parish, to whom only they are (in his Judgment) *Pastors*, and to the others but *Lecturers*: One would have thought this Man should not have of late contended so earnestly in the behalf of *Tithes*, and *Tithe-taking Ministry*, against whom he had so vigorously disputed; it had not become him to connive, in

In the Station He is, at the *Chast* of a Na-
tional Ministry of Christ, (for, according to
his Principles, it is a Curse) they being
only *Ministers of Christ* objective; and as they
teach him, not *constitutive*; and by his
appointment; but to have undeceived the
Magistrates and Army herein. It is true in-
deed, some *Independents* do retain a Com-
munion with, and own the *Presbyterians* for true
Churches in England, because they suppose
them to have been once gathered rightly:
And they say, they need only to be rectified,
and not established a-new; they are like a
Garden full of Weeds, which want to be new
contrived, but weeded. I must confess this
sort of Men to deal much with Similitudes;
and after a confident Assertion, the Con-
firmation is but an Allegory out of Scripture,
or a Simile. But here it is very gross (if
they deceive themselves only, and not others)
to think the *Churches in England* now are
true *Churches* and rightly gathered (for it
is that, and not Profession of one common
Doctrine, that makes a *Church*) as to Sub-
stance, because *Simon Zelotes or Joseph of
Arimathea did convert* some in *Scotland*
1600 years ago. But whether he ever were
there, or whether his Preaching there doth
infer an Establishing of a *Church*, I must
have better proof than *Legends Ecclesiastical*.
As for *Austin the Monk*; it is unquestion-
able that he did not gather *Churches* as to
Matter of Form, in such a way as the *In-
dependents* call right. But suppose they were
once

once gathered rightly, which the most fond Supposal cannot extend beyond a few Churches; Can any tell where they were, that were so gathered? And were they not *Churches of Persons*, not *Churches of Places*? If so, What is this to Parochial Churches? And if they were so gathered, what necessity is there they should have continued so in substance till now? If these Men were to write Politicks, they would prove to us, that notwithstanding the alteration of the *Saxon Hierarchy* to *Monarchy*, and all the Changes brought in since by the *Conquest*, and after-times, even this present Constitution of a *Republike*, that we were still the same *Government*, and the same *Model* under *accidental Changes* only. I speak sincerely, that upon the most Impartial Enquiry that I yet could make into Church-Constitution, which is thought (by them) to have been introduced by the Apostles, and the variation brought about by Popish Usurpation, together with the Posture of things under Queen *Elizabeth*, and later days, I cannot but think the *Civil Changes* that have happened amongst us and our Predecessors to have been the lesser, and yet I have not seen that Man, who esteemed the *Change* in the *Common-wealth* to be but a *Change* in Circumstances, an accidental Alteration, like to the over-growing of Weeds; nor do I think there is any who could excuse now to the State, his endeavours to re-establish a single Person, by a

Plea

Plea of not subverting or altering the Government, but only weeding the same Republick. A Garden may in time be so overgrown with Weeds, as to cease to be a Garden, though it should be still out of doubt that it once was one.

VIII. Whether the Ministers do well to direct their Succession unto Christ by the means of Antichrist? Whether they can in any reason deduce themselves from the Popish Clergy, since they do not ordain Ministers of the Gospel, but Massing Priests, with whom to preach, and that publickly, is no Ministerial Act, though the main Act of our Ministry? Whether the Reformed Divines from the several parts of France, the Palatinate, Switzerland, and Geneva, being solemnly met to confer at Poiffy before the King and Nobility of France, did not reject such Ordination? As also Martin Luther, and Anthony Sadeel? (a) Whether ours do not ill impose upon them a Call and Ordination which they disown? (b)

At Poiffy there was a Conference betwixt the Papists and Protestants, whose Delegates there, were Augustinus Marieratus, Franciscus a Pauli Fano, Jo. Raimondus Merlinius, Joannes Malo, Francis Morellus, Nic. Tobias, Theodorus Besca, Claudius Bofferius, Jo. Boquinus, Jo. Viretus, Jo. Turrius, Nic. Gallacius, Jo. Spina, and

Durer also was of the same Judgment, as we may gather out of Le-deel de voe Minister And Brekeij in his Protestantse Afdeeling (p. 361.) inform us of more of that Opinion.

In Swiss in his History saith, there were there Twelve Ministers, and Twenty two Deputies of the Protestant Churches, ad ann. 1560.

and Peter Martyr of Zurich, these being deputed and met at Poissy to confer about Religion, being asked (as it is usual now-a-days) out of Terullian, *Quis est iste? Unde venisti?* *Quid agis in vinea mea?* Who are you? Whence come you? What do ye in my Vineyard? A Question which the Papists would not ask, if they had sent them: The Protestant Delegates (for I nowhere read that any of them did dissent from Beza who gave this reply) did avow their Call not to have been from the Papists, who were there ready to disprove any such answer, but Extraordinary. The whole Story is thus recorded by *Thuanus Histor.* t. 2: 1691. l. 28. p. 451 Which I

Beza was appointed by common consent to reply, as *Anton. Faustus* reports it in his *Life*, p. 23. edit Geneva 1606. that the Ministers did not only come from several parts of France, but Peter Martyr was sent from Zurich and Michael Diodorus and Pierre Bohme from the Palatinate: so that it is to be looked on as all their Judgment. *Anton. Faustus* nor is there an Argument in *vit. Beze* p. 24. & 46.

There is a very good Reply in the whole Controversie about the Call of the Ministry, as it is Judicially managed on both sides in England, which is not to be found in the Popish and Protestant Writers near the time of the Reformation.

Claudine Espençay, a learned Man, and "peaceable," being commanded to speak by the Cardinal of Lorraine — said, That he often used to admire by what Authority,

and

and Call, the Protestants became *Ministers* ;
 and since they did not alledge any [mark
 as to matter of fact, the procedure of, the
 Protestants in those times, 1561.] from
 whom they had received *imposition of Hands*,
 how they could be esteemed of as lawful
Pastors, it being manifest thereby that they
 were destitute of any other ordinary Call ;
 and seeing that the performance of Mirac-
 les was necessary to evince an extraordi-
 nary Call, and that the Protestants did
 not atchieve any, it did by necessary
 deduction follow that they were entred
 into the House of God, by a way neither
 ordinary nor extraordinary. — *Berzæ* did
 hereupon reply, That as to a legitimate
 Call, the *Imposition of Hands* was no necessary
 note thereof ; the Chief and Substantial
 Tokens thereof, were good Life, sound
 Doctrine, and Election of the People :
 Nor was it any wonder if they had not
 received *imposition of Hands* from the Or-
 dinary [*ab iis qui vulgo ordinarii appellantur*].
 For how could that be, they being to
 reprove their corrupt Life, Superstition,
 and false Doctrines ? Or could it be ex-
 pected that they should ever be allowed
 of them, who were Enemies to the Truths
 which they defended ? Neither on the
 other side were Miracles necessary to an
 extraordinary Call ; as he proved by the
 Examples of *Isaiab, Daniel, Amos, Zæcharias,*
 and *Paul*. Thus *Thuanus*.

ibid. p. 46.

The same
 answer of
 Beza is re-
 corded in his
 Life by At-
 ton. *Fals.*
 p. 31.

As for *Berz*, his particular judgment concerning the deriving of Orders, and Ordination, from *Papacy*, you shall find it set down in his answer to *Saravini's* second Chapter concerning the different Degrees of the Ministry. That learned and solid Divine had said, That the first Reformers had (most of them) an ordinary Call ; and that being ordained once, they needed no more a second Institution, than did those *Magistrates*, *Priests* and *Levites*, who having been once Idolaters, did afterwards exterminate Idolatry and Superstition. This Plea (which is to me of bad ones the best, and which is that the *Episcoparians* do embrace) is by *Berz* thus refuted, ' But what ordinary Vocation is that which you say the first Reformers had, excepting some few of them ? Is it not *Papal* ? For these are your words, If at this present the Bishops of the French Church, would but free themselves, and their Churches, from the Papal Tyranny, and renounce and purge out that Idolatry and Superstition which is amongst them, they need not any other Call than what they already have. How is this ? Shall we think then the Popish Orders to be so valid, in which there is not any preceding enquiry into Manners, no such procedure observed as is inviolably by divine Right to be kept in Elections and Ordinations ; which are nothing else but a base Merchandise of that Romish Whore, more vile than the price of any Harlot, which yet the Lord forbade to be brought into his

Berz ad.
Saravini.
Cap. 2. &
dis. sec.
ministr.

his Temple: In fine, wherein some are sent not to Preach, but to pervert the Gospel; others not to Teach, but to Sacrifice; and for the performance of *that detestable Abomination*, shall we think so highly thereof, that as often as any *false Bishops* shall be converted to *true Christianity*, immediately all the Filth, Uncleanness and Impurity of such Orders collated is washed away? Nay, but whom the Lord hath so regenerated, with what Face or Conscience will he be able to forsake *Papery*, and yet not abjure his irregular [*inordinatissimum*] Ordination? Or if he do abjure it, How shall he by Virtue thereof claim an *Authority to Teach*? Yet I do not deny but such Persons, if they be sound in Doctrine, of good Life, and fit to rule a Flock, they may be constituted, of unlawful and false *Bishops*, new and legitimate *Pastors*. This is the judgment of *Beza*, who was himself a *Papist*, had two Benefices, and should have been an *Abbot*, but was never in Orders, and could not be ignorant of the nature of the *Papish Ordination*: And it is in reference to this answer of the Protestants at *Poissy*, that *Cheznitius* a *Lutheran Divine* (as he is cited by *Saravia*) saith, 'That the *Sacramentarians* (those are the *Calvinists*) differ not from *Anabaptists*, when (faith *Cheznitius*) in France the *Papists* and *Sacramentarians* disputed about their Call, and the former asked the latter what Vocation they had; *Beza* answered, That it was neither *Mediate* nor *Immediate*,

Defens. Sarav.
TAV. ad. 2.
Bezan. c. 2.

‘ Immediate, but an extraordinary Vocation which
‘ they had no Teach in France: And I hear that
‘ at Geneva they have this custom, to instruct
‘ some in Theology, that they may afterwards send
‘ them abroad into France.

As for the Judgment of *Luther*, who was himself in *Orders*, and a *Priest*, and a *Doctor of Divinity*, amongst the *Papists*, and so knew what they had conferred on him, and what was the import of their *Ordination*, he being excellently versed in the ways and pleas of the *Romanists*, yet doth not he make use of those nice *Apologies* which others have made for him since, but he doth absolutely disavow and disclaim their *Ordination*, in his *Treatise of the Ministry*, in the words following.

‘ Thus every Man ought justly to fear,
‘ who loveth Christ, and rather to endure
‘ any thing than that he be ordained by the
‘ Papists; because in their *Orders* all things
‘ are managed with such a wicked prepo-
‘ sterousnes, that if they were not Blind
‘ and Mad, they would perceive how they
‘ do mock God to his Face: For *Ordination*
‘ being destined to that intent, according to
‘ the *Word of God*, and the *Decrees* as well
‘ as *Practice* of the *Apostles*, that some
‘ should be constituted *Ministers of God's Word*
‘ amongst the People: I say, the *Ministry of*
‘ the *Word of God*, by which the sacred My-
‘ steries may be dispensed unto the People;
‘ it is that which ought to be instituted by
‘ *Ordination*, as being the principal Affair
‘ for

' for continuing the Church of God, and in
 ' which resides the *All of Ecclesiastical Orders*:
 ' Since without the Word there is no cer-
 ' tainty of any thing in the Church, and
 ' by the Word alone all things are ascer-
 ' tained. But my Friends, the Papists, do
 ' not so much as dream of this Ministry at
 ' their collating of Orders. What then do
 ' they do ?

' First, being stricken with an Universal
 ' Blindnes, they do not so much as know
 ' the Word of God, or the Ministry thereof,
 ' especially the *Bishops* who ordain ; how
 ' then indeed can they by their Orders con-
 ' stitute Ministers of the Gospel ? Moreover
 ' instead of *Ministers of God's Word*, they
 ' Ordain Sacrificers, who shall offer up the
 ' unbloody *Sacrifice of the Mass*, and bear
 ' *Confessions*: For this is that which the *Bishop*
 ' intends, when he gives them the *Chalice*
 ' in their hands, and bestows on them the
 ' power of *Consecrating and Sacrificing for the*
 ' *Quick and the Dead* (a Power which they
 ' boast neither the Angels, nor the *Virgin-*
 ' *Mother of God* to be possessed of, but them-
 ' selves, fellows worse than Robbers or
 ' Panders) and when he mysteriously breathes
 ' into the Ears of them, appointing them to
 ' be *Confessors*, and saying, *Receive the Holy*
 ' *Ghost*, this is that most glorious Power of
 ' Consecrating the Body of Christ, and for-
 ' giving Sins.

' But let me be accounted a *Fool*, a *Knaue*,
 ' a *Liar*, if there be any one Ordained by
 ' them

them who dare say that at such time as he
 received Orders, he was commanded to
 dispense the Mysteries of Christ, to teach
 the Gospel, and govern the Church which
 Christ hath purchased by his Blood. There
 is not one of Them who ever hears of such
 a thing, nor doth he think it to appertain
 unto him; but he receiveth the Chalice, and
 supposes this to be the only work incum-
 bent upon him, to consecrate and offer
 up Christ in the Mass, and to hear Con-
 fessions.— This is the Power which ma-
 keth a Priest, he who hath received this,
 is formally in Orders; for the Ministry of
 the Word, for Preaching, that is an Infe-
 rior Act, to which there needs no other
 Call, than that the Parish-Priest or Magi-
 strate invite you; To this performance
 there needs no Character, this Function is
 no Order, as being not annexed to the Bishops
 and Pastors, but to be transmitted to the
 inferior sort of Men, and the illiterate
 vulgar Rabble. Because to dispense the
 Mysteries of God, and to feed Souls with
 the Bread of Life, the Everlasting Word,
 this is not [with the Papists] the Sacra-
 ment of Order, but to Mass it, that, that is
 the Sacrament of Order.

Luther de
 ministr. in-
 ter op. 366.
 c. 1.

Anton. Sa-
 deel, de po-
 cat. ministr.
 inter op. in
 Folio, p. 541.
 c. 2.

That personal Succession is not necessary,
 so saith Sadeel; yea, it is so far from being
 necessary, that it is neither true nor pro-
 bable that it is requisite; for by what Text
 of Scripture is that proved? In that most
 accurate description of the duty of a Bishop,
 the

there is not a word concerning an uninterrupted Succession. Why then do we permit our Adversaries, not only to add unto the words of the Scripture, but even to add that, without which, they deny that the Function of a Bishop [*a Minister*] can subsist ?

Reader, Mark this passage, for now it is so far from being allowed, that it is thought *Socinianism* to argue thus from *1 Tim. 3.* and *Tit. 1.* It is an arguing negatively out of Scripture, denying any Glosses and Additions. *Non credimus, quia non legimus;* we believe it not, because we read it not : This was a Saying much pressed by the first Reformers and Puritans, but now they have forgot it, or else they will not allow others that liberty which they took ; for they made themselves, and their Reasonings, to judge whether it were read there or no ; for the *Papists* they vouched Scripture, and Fathers ; the *Protestants* did the like : Yet did the latter deny that to be found in Scripture, for which the former did produce colourable Texts (and in the case of the Ministry, the same which are now urged against the *Quakers*, &c.) because they could oppose them with other Texts which they imagined more pregnant (though the *Papists* did not, but solved them) and could find Solutions for their Objections, or else that they were additions to the Text.

Ibid. p. 543. That Personal Succession is insignificant without a Profession of true Doctrine, saith *Sadeel*: ‘ For it is not to be doubted, but ‘ the *Arrians* had a visible Succession and ‘ Ordination, [better than any Reformed Divines can pretend to] ‘ yet was not that ‘ to their advantage. Now concerning the Profession of the Truth, he is mad who dissent from the Ministers, and yet will allow them to be in the right: And if he be convinced they are in the wrong, he is (I think) hereby excused from valuing their Ordination. To illustrate this further, I shall set down in brief what *Sadeel* delivers as an Exposition upon *Matt. 28. 19, 20.* *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you: And lo. I am with you always unto the end of the World.*

He observes, ‘ That Christ speaks not to the Pastors alone of the Church, but to all the Saints; that is, he promiseth to the whole Church, that he will be with them always: This is easily collected from the Circumstances of the place.’ For thus saith Christ, *Go teach all Nations to keep my Commandments, and behold I am with you, &c.* There is none but sees out of the Context, and from the Conjunction *Copulative*, that the last words refer as well to those that are to be taught, as to them that teach. No less than Christ elsewhere, *John 17. 19, 20.* pro-

Torriani So-
phism, p. 594
595. Edit.
prædictæ.

professeth that he doth not pray *only* for
 his *Apostles*, but for them *also* which should
 believe through their word. Besides, (give
 me leave to regulate his Argument, for I
 vary not his sense) If *Christ* will be with
 them for ever, it doth not follow that it
 must be effected by a personal Succession:
 For such is the Nature of true *Faith* and
Baptism, that where they are, *Christ* can-
 not be absent, *Gal.* 3. 27. *As many of you*
as have been baptised into Christ, have put on
Christ. And *John* 14. 23. *If a Man love*
me, he will keep my words: and my Father
will love him, and we will come unto him, and
make our abode with him. And many other
 such like Texts may be alledged, whereby
 the Sophism deduced hence, is destroyed.—
 But how is *Christ* with them *always*?
 Some say, *in their Preaching and administering*
of Baptism. But this too narrow and empty
 an Exposition; as if *Christ* were only then
 with his Church, whilst they were Preach-
 ing and Sacramentising it. And for so
 much as they speak of his being with the
 Apostles and their Successors by Ordina-
 tion, this is also Fond, for the main
 thing to be upheld, is a perpetuating the
 Doctrine of *Christ* by Succession, without
 which, Ordination is an useless Ceremony.
 It is therefore but foolishly done of them,
 to omit the matter of Doctrine which is
 expressly mentioned in the Text, and to
 discourse about Ordination, of which

' there is no mention. I retort their Exposition thus, *I am with you whilst you teach the Nations what I have commanded.* Hence I collect, That Christ is not with them who do not teach his Gospel, but their own Imaginations; nor can such be Successors to the Apostles, though they never so much exalt themselves through a conceited Ordination. Ordination! it is no note of Truth or just Authority, though certainly and apparently derived from the Apostles. To pass by an infinity of other proofs, when Paul told the Elders of Ephesus, Acts 20. 30. *Of your own selves shall Men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away Disciples after them.* Surely those false Teachers had Ordination, yet were not Successors to the Apostles. Shew us first that you are lawfully called; next (seeing Christ saith, Go teach) shew us the truth of the Doctrines you deliver; and then you may possibly advantage your selves thereby; especially if you can prove, that there ought to be Teach all Nations; for so the Text saith positively, *Go teach all Nations:* But Reason and Experience inform us, that it is false, that Christ did promise the Perpetuation of such a Ministry. It is Truth which upholds a Church, and not a successive Ministry; yea, since the Truth hath not failed, and the Apostolick Successors have failed, it is a sign that Truth is and may be preserved other-

otherwise than by them : Yea, in this is the Purity and exceeding great Verity of God's Word, that it doth not depend upon lying Men. But to evince further the no-necessity of a successive Ministry to uphold the Church, I give you a double Instance ; for in the Church of *Israel*^{1 Kings 12.} ordinary Succession was interrupted, and yet there were seven thousand who had not bowed their Knees to *Baal*, but retained the Truth. On the other side, in *Jerusalem*, whilst *Abaz* did reign, there^{1 Kings 19.} was an outward visible Succession of a Priesthood, yet was the Land overspread with Errors, and the Temple of God shut up, and *Urias* the Priest did profane the Worship of God at the Command of the King. So in *Jerusalem* there was a successive Priesthood in our Saviour's time,^{2 Kings 16.} yet were they very erroneous in their Doctrines, and those very Successionists did Crucifie Christ.^{2 Chron. 38.}

After this *Sadeel* enlarges against the Popish Ordination, that it is null, that it hath been interrupted. In that part of his Discourse which concerns the Nullity of them, he agrees with *Beza*; and as to their being interrupted, his Proofs (though too long to recite) are as evincing, as it is likewise clear that a Succession, if made out for some few Generations, yet unless it be continued to the end, it is but an impertinent Labour to insist on it ; if it be once lost, it is never to be retrieved, but by extraordi-

Sadeel also
fully discus-
seth the bu-
siness of Suc-
cession in his
Answer to
the Monks
of Bourde-
aux, Art. 61,

62, 63.

Sola possessio non sufficit in beneficiis Ecclesiasticis, nisi adsit canonica institutio. A sole Possession is not sufficient in Ecclesiastical Benefices, unless there concur also a Canonical Institution. *Extravag. de instit. cap. ex frequentibus.* And *Prescriptio non prodest cum habent malam fidem.* A Prescription doth not profit, in case it be grounded upon an evil Conscience, and therefore fithence Ministers, whose Title is null, are *male fidei possessores*, unjust Possessors, *frau & dolus eorum sibi patrocinari non debet.* Their Deceit and Collusion ought not to support them. *Extravag. de praescript. c. 51. diligenti, &c. cum omne.* As the Author of the Abstract of *Acts, Laws, and Canons of Church-Government*, published under Q. Eliz. doth argue, p. 68.

nary Means: And tho' a Man be in Possession of a Parsonage or Bene-
fice, that is not sufficient warrant for our Subje-
ction to him, and own-
ing of him for Christ's Minister ; to assert or
own a thing, evidence is
requisite. Nor is the case
here, as in the *Civil Ma-
gistracy* ; if he have Pos-
session we submit, but do
not acknowledge his Ti-
tle to be Just ; nor doth
he require more than

such compliance. But for a Minister to submit to him, and yet not to own his Title, it is impossible, so connexed is a due entrance to the discharge of the Ministry : We have no warrant for Submission to an usurp'd Ministry, for Magistracy I think we have ; God who blames some for running unspent, *Jer. 14. 14, 15.* bids not that we should receive them. However there is an infinite difference in the Acknowledgments we make to the one, and wherewith the other will be payed. So that Mr. Baxter might have waved such a Plea as this for the Ministry. But it is not my intent to refute him, but to shew the Opinion of the Reformed Divines at first, and that they did not assent to the Arguments now used, as demonstrative for a standing Ministry.

The

The whole business of *Call of Ministers*, is agitated by the aforesaid *Sadeel*, and who ever hath but the confidence to think himself in the right, may there find a defence against all Objections out of Scripture or Fathers, as to matter of *Call*. There he will see the Nullity of a Succession apostatized : There he will see, for his Satisfaction, how successive Ordination is so far from being designed to overthrow the Beast, that it is an extraordinary *Call* which must do it.

' For doth not God in the *Revelation*, Chap. 11. 3. say, That he will raise up two Witnesses, that he will give them Power, and they shall Prophesie against the Beast ?

' Is it not said, 2 *Theff.* 2. 8. that *God shall consume* Antichrist, the wicked one, *with the Spirit of his mouth* ? In that Text we shall find that there will in those days be no visible Succession amidst the Corruptions of the Church, Apostacy being opposite to Succession : And that the Church shall be restored again by the sincere Preaching of the Gospel, which must be extraordinary, since that Man of Sin is to be consumed by the Spirit of the Lord, and not by himself : The Argument runs thus, *He who opposed himself to Christ, and corrupted the Church, as far as in him lay, by his Traditions and Falshoods, be is to be destroyed by the Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord* ; that is, by sincere Preaching of the Word : But it is clear, that the sincere Preaching of the Word, cannot be with or from him who hath corrupted

*Sadeel de
vocat. mi-
nistr.*

ibid. p.357.

corrupted the Churcb, for then he could not be
 ὁ ἀντιχείρως, he who opposeth himself: The
 sincere Preaching of the Gospel then must have
 a different rise: But there can be no Preaching
 without Preachers, therefore those Preachers
 must not be raised in and out of the ordinary
 Constitution, but extraordinarily [præter ordi-
 nem solitum] by the Lord, that so the Errors
 and Blasphemies may be confuted by the Spirit
 of the Mouth of Christ; and not by the
 Spirit of the Mouth of Antichrist. This will
 be more easily understood, if we consider

Ipsum Dei
 verbum, ipsa
 Evangelii
 predicatio
 secum infert
 ministrum
 Ecclesiasti-
 cum.

it well. For the Preaching of the Gospel, the
 Word of God it self, where that is found, there
 is an Ecclesiastical Ministry. And where
 that is not found, I oppose to all Argu-
 ments that can be brought about Ordina-
 tion, this one Saying of Christ, Matt. 5.13.
 If the Salt bath lost its savour, wherewith shall
 it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing,
 but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot
 of Men.—And for them who laugh at us
 for Extraordinary Ministers, we reply thus,
 That it is either to be understood of such
 as so arise, that they violate what is the
 due and appointed Order: And thus the
 Pontificians, as they recede from Apostolical
 Prescripts, and that Order which is insti-
 tuted by God, so without doubt they are
 Extraordinary, and retrench upon Order.
 Or Extraordinary, signifies no more than
 a Breach upon what is the Custom, Usage,
 and Order in Fashion, not considering, that
 such Order in its being, is but an Usurpa-
 tion.

tion upon what ought to be, and that a
 Departure or Deviation from it, is but a
 resuming of that course which had been
 interrupted.— In a word, *Sadeel* with
 much enforcement urgeth these Argu-
 ments against the Popish Ordination ;
 ‘ There never was, nor never will be, any p. 559.
 true ordinary Calling, without due Ele-
 ction, unless we will expunge the whole
 Scripture, and ancient Histories : But
 there is no due Election amongst the
 Papists, but they intrude themselves into
 Ecclesiastical Dignities, and get Benefices,
 as it were, by Prey : Therefore, as with-
 out due Election there is no Vocation, so
 without Vocation there can be no Suc-
 cession in their Ministry.— And, which
 reason alone he thinks to be conclusive,
 so as that we might wave all other. ‘ All
 the Bishops of the *Roman Church* are de-
 rived from the Romish Sea, and have from p. 560.
 thence all their right of Vocation and
 Election. But the Papal Primacy is re-
 pugnant to the Word of God, and un-
 known to the ancient Bishops ; nor was
 it either in the Church, or over the Church,
 so long as the true Bishops of the Church
 did remain. Indeed they who demand
 Miracles of us, do impose upon us a Mon-
 ster, in that they would have the Voca-
 tion of Bishops to be Legitimate and Right,
 because it is totally derived from the Pope’s
 Authority, whom yet our Doctors have
 at large evinced, to have himself no

‘ Voca-

‘ Vocation nor Appointment at all from
‘ God.

Not much unlike to this last passage of Sadeel's, is that of Dr. Owen (Dean of Christ-Church in Oxon) in his Reply to Dr. Cawdrey, who it seems derived *his* and *his Friends Call* from a *Succession* thorough the *Papacy*; salving all by a distinction of the *Papacy* from the Church of *Rome*. After Dr. Owen had related the passage already mentioned out of *Bezza*, and owned it (p. 47 and 48.) he professeth he doth not understand that distinction of his Adversaries. ‘ I hope he will not
‘ be angry, if I profess my dis-ability to
‘ understand it: (All Men cannot be wise
‘ a-like) if the *Papacy* comprise the *Pope*,
‘ and all Papal Jurisdiction and Power, with
‘ the Subjection of Men thereunto; if it
‘ denote all the *Idolatries*, *False Worship*, and
‘ *Heresies* of that Society of Men; I do know
‘ that all those are confirmed by *Church-Acts*
‘ of that Church; and that in the *Church-
publick-Sense* of that Church, no Man was
‘ a Member of it, but by virtue of the Union
‘ that consisted in that *Papacy*, it being placed
‘ always by them in all the Definitions of
‘ their Church; as also that there was nei-
‘ ther Church-Order, nor Church-Power,
‘ nor Church-Act, nor Church-Confession,
‘ nor Church-Worship amongst them, but
‘ what consisted in the *Papacy*.

Either I understand not the *Doctor*, or he speaks more than he seems to own; he doth not only Un-Minister all that deduce their

Call,

Call, from a *Succession* continued by Romish *Babylon*, but he *Un-Baptises* them also. I think these words of his are of an Import not less than I speak of; ‘It is sufficiently ^{In his Defence, p.45.} easie to manifest, that whosoever resolves his Interest in Gospel-Priviledges [I hope the Preaching of the Word, either as to Hearer, or Deliverer, is a Gospel-Priviledge] into this Foundation [of deducing it thorough the *Papacy*] can have no assurance of Faith, nay, nor tolerable probable Conjecture that he is Baptised, or was ever made Partaker of any Ordinance of the Gospel. Who (think you) are those that he Incapacitates, as to all Gospel-Priviledges, hereby? All the *Episcoparians*, and Mr. *Cawdrey* and all his *Abettors*, if not all the *Presbyterians*. And yet this *Doctor* not only holds *Communion* with them in part, owns them (or equivocates) in the *Ministry*, and hath of late contributed to the upholding of a *Ministry* bottomed upon no other *Pretences*, in Point of *Being*, and *Maintenance* by *Tytbe*, a way of the *Babylonish Appointment* perfectly. But it may be, as upon the account of something, whose Efficacy they will not own, he admitteth them to be right worthy *Ministers* of the *Gospel of Christ*; so upon the account of something, which neither be nor they will avow, did he carry on those late Endeavours. Surely he did thereby (if I mistake not) ^{of Schism, p. 197.} keep up in this Particular, what God would have pulled down, (Schism, p. 198.) for it was the up-holding of them in the way

way by him otherwise dis-allowed, which was debated.

(b) The Protestant Divines, that they may secure themselves in their Function, against such as question their *Vocation*, have, since the Death of *Luther*, and other the most eminent *First Reformers*, imposed upon them a *Call*, which they did never own, as I have already evinced. They say that they had a *Call* from the *Papacy*; but they deny it, *Utri credimus?* Who is to be believed? They say, That though they were ordained to be *Mass-Priests*, yet withal they were appointed to *preach the Goffel too*: And particularly *Luther* was solemnly made a *Doctor* at *Witteberge*, and received thereby Power, yea, did swear to expound the Scripture, and defend the *Apostolick Truths*, in despite of all Hereticks. But hereunto it is replied,

That even in the Judgment of the *Papists*, liberty to preach the Word is a natural Right, and so could not be conferred at their *Ordination*, or *Doctoral Inauguration*.

*Satav. de-
fens.de div.
grad.minist.
c.26.ex Ger.
fone.*

It is true, the Form used in promoting of *Doctors in Paris* is, *I give you License to Dispute, Teach, Read, here and all over the World*.

Yet saith *Henricus Lancilotus*, an *Augustine Friar*, and *Doctor in Divinity*, in reply to *Humilius* (*Capistr. Hann. c. 8. p. 67.*) who made use of this Defence for *Luther's Call*;

"In saying, he was a *Doctor of Witteberge*,
thereby to prove his *Mission*: You do but
Sport your self in words, and talk to no
purpose; for a *Doctor's Degree* includes a
publick

‘ publick Testimony of the Learning of the Person promoted, but not a *Mission*. How many *Doctors* and *Licentiates* are there in *Lovain*, and other of our Universities, whom yet no Man that hath any Wit in his Head, will say, are thereby constituted *Ministers of the Word and Sacraments*, without a peculiar *Ordination* besides of the Bishop; much less that they have Power to send others. Nor is this only the Opinion of the *Papists*, it is the Universal Opinion of the Reformed *Divines* beyond Sea, and their Descendants in *England*, that Academical Degrees are no *Call*, nor part of a *Call* to the *Ministry*. *Saravia* giveth this caution to young University-men, ‘ Young Men, puff'd up with the publick Testimony which the University hath given them of their Learning, ought to take heed that they do not thereupon think themselves to be assumed into the number of *Presbyters* of the Church, unless they have a further *Ordination*.

*De dev.
grad. minist.
c. 26.*

*In anim. d.
ad c. 26.*

Beza remarks upon this passage of his, ‘ I say they cannot so much as create *Doctors of the Church*; for by what Right, Reason, or Conscience, is the Right of Election, which appertains to the Church (and without which, whoever enters into the Church is a *Thief* and *Robber*) translated unto the University? Let the Governours of the University give to their diligent Scholars a due Testimony of their Learning and Piety; actual Power and Authority to Teach; only the Church can give them, from whence by.

by due order, they must receive it, if they
 will be truly *Doctors*. And *Calvin* also
 distinguishes betwixt a *Pastor* and a *Doctor*,
 That the *Doctors* have nothing to do with
 the Discipline, or Administration of Sacra-
 ments. In fine, Since it is the general Opin-
 ion of the *Reformed Divines*, that a *Doctor*
 is but of the Rank of *School-Masters*, and no
Clergy-Man, such an Institution doth not
 prove the *Graduates* to have been thereby
 ordained *Ministers*. It is true, to the *Papists*
 it may pass as an Argument *ad homines*, that
 they appointed *Luther* to preach the *Gospel*, and
 confute *Heresies*. But they will reply again,
 That they degraded him, and that they never
 gave him power to teach any other Do-
 ctrine nor *Gospel* than was agreed upon
 and received, not in *Letter* only, but *Sense*,
 by the *Romish Church*. And that this was
 the Intent of the *Popish Universities* beyond
 Sea, if not express *Declaration*, I doubt not
 but it may be made appear by *Subscriptions*,
 and Acknowledgments made at their *Promotion*, if we understood the Particulars, or
 may guess at them by the particular Cu-
 stoms of the *University of Oxon*, in its Statutes.
 As for their having been ordained *Priests*,
 that to preach is no part of that Order, I
 have declared out of *Luther*, who was or-
 dained *Priest*, and could not but know what
Ordination he received. But furthermore,
 this is acknowledged by *Dom. Soto*, upon the
 fourth Book of the *Sentences*. By the Law
 of God, or Divine Right, Preaching is not

Distinc. 1.

qua 4. Art. 6.

p. 61. c. 2.

a Duty annexed unto the
 Holy Orders: Nay, the
 Prophets of old were
 Preachers, and would be
 still, if they were now
 alive; and the Hermites
 did preach in the Des-
 sert, yet were not they
 Priests; nor is that usage
 thereupon condemned;
 yea, Pope *Gregory*, in his first Book of
 Dialogues, doth commend a certain Lay-
 Man called *Equitius*, because that he did
 preach to the People. Besides in the Ordina-
 nation of Priests, there is not any mention
 made of Preaching; nor would it be fitting
 to enjoyn them that, without a more
 strict Examination than they do undergo.
 But he says, It is by positive Laws of Mens
 Appointment, that any are prohibited to
 preach; which he evinces out of the *Pope's*
Decretals, who gave the Rise to such Pre-
 scriptions as our *Ministers* would coun-
 tenance. All Priests amongst them may not *Ibid.*
 preach; it being one of the Articles which
 the Council of Constance (*Session 8 & 15.*) did
 censure in *Wickliff* and *Huss*, that *All Priests*, Fines man-
dati sunt dil-
ligenter ob-
servandi.
 by virtue of their Ordination, were bound to
 preach. The *Bishop's License* is necessary to a
 Man, that he do lawfully preach amongst
 the *Papists*; and it is with reference here-
 unto that they alledge *Rom. 10. 15.* How
 shall they preach except they be sent? And if
 the *Bishop* please to license any, a *Lay-Man*
 amongst

amongst the Papists may preach and expound, but not administer the Sacraments.

An Example hereof we have in *Benedictus Arias Montanus*, who was a Physician, studied Phylick under *Petrus Mena* at the University of *Completum*, and being afterwards Practitioner thereof in his Native Country near *Sevil*, he was sent for by the Magistrates and Fathers of the Inquisition at a Town called *Lerina* bordering upon *Portugal* (without any Ordination) that he might expound and preach the Word of God to the People in Lent; which work he performed as well out of regard unto the Honesty of the Action, as of the Dignity of the Persons which called him thither. This be related of himself in his Preface to *Arcæus de cur. vuln.* So *Ignatius* and three other Companions of his, being no way in Orders, or owners of much Learning at that time, did at *Complutum*, an University of Spain, publickly instruct the Common People in Piety and a good Life, as well as the Principles of Religion; yet were they not prohibited, nor condemned, for such their Zeal for the Salvation of others; but after that the Inquisitors of *Toledo* had enquired into the Life and Deportment of him and his Associates, and found them to be Men of Innocent Behaviour, and Orthodox in Judgment, they never said any thing to them, but reported the Case to the Vicar of the Arch-Bishop, *John Figueroa*, who sent to *Ignatius* and his Friends this Message, That since upon a strict Enquiry they had

Alcala de Henarez.

Sacri verbi populo per quadragesimæ tempus enunciandi & exponendi causa.

Alcala de Henarez.

bad been found, as to their Lives and Discourses, unblameable, (though they were illiterate) they might proceed as they should think fit, and without Let or Molestation, endeavour the Good and Salvation of their Neighbours. Ribadeneria in

When will our Ministers deal so with a Quaker? Yet those were the Bloody Inquisitors.

vit. Ignatii, l. i. c. 14. Afterwards Ignatius and his Companions at Salamanca, another University in Spain, were examined, not about their Call to Teach, but about their Doctrine, and Abilities, and Life: And being found not very Learned, they were prohibited to discourse publickly of abstruse Points; but otherwise it was left free for them, according to their usual Custom, to teach the People, and discourse of Divine Matters, *ibid.*

c. 15. Much more might be produced to evince this Truth, that in the repute of the Papists, to preach was not a particular Act of the Priesthood, or Ministry, whereunto they did ordain Men; nor was Ordination any way necessary thereunto, but a License from the Bishop or Ordinary. Nor is it difficult to shew, that the Episcoparian (as distinct from the Geneva Principles) did not account Preaching a part, much less the principal and constitutive Act of their Ministry; whereunto they did ordain Men. I shall not vouch here what Dr. Heylin, or Dr. Pocklington, Men of unquestionable Learning and great Reading, have written, by way of compliance

See the Examination of William Thorpe Priest, concerning his Preaching without License: The Bishop tells him he never sent him to preach. And that Martyr saith, That such as were licensed, were limited by unlawful Oaths in their Preaching, whether they were Priests, or other such Preachers. Acts and Mon. p. 532.

1559.

with the *Tenets of Popish Writers*, hereupon:

The like Injunction is given by K. Elizabeth, published in the first Year of her Edward 6. 9. 10. And in the Ecclesia- sic. Canons published under K. James 1604. can. 49, 50, But refer my self to the Injunctions of Q. *Reign, to the Clergy and Layty, §. 8.* None are to be admitted to Preach, but such as shall appear to be sufficiently licensed thereunto by the Queen's Majesty, or the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, or the Arch-Bishop of York, in either of their Provinces, or the Bishop of the Diocese, or by the Queen's Majesties Visitours. And such as shall be so licensed, they shall gladly receive to declare the Word of God at convenient times, without any Resistance or Contradiction, Here is no enquiry to be made into their Ordination, in reference to a Man's Preaching, but that he be licensed.

Reader, This Controversie about ordaining *Ministers* to Preach, is no new thing, though some have endeavoured to persuade me so, for it is as old as the Reformation in the days of Q. Elizabeth, the clergy in being still denying Preaching to be a ministerial Act, but that they were true *Ministers*, and rightfully entred upon Orders who could not Preach, but Read. This is evident (beyond what I have said here) by a Book printed then, sallied, *An Abstract of Acts, Canons and Constitutions, in force, respecting Church-Government.* A piece soberly written, and by one excellently skilled in the Civil, Canon, and Common Law. He saith (p. 43.) that whereas in the Form of *Ministerial Ordination*, towards the latter end, it is said, *Take Authority to Preach where thou shal be appointed.* They took hold no otherwise to suffer them to Preach, then as they should be licensed afterward by writing. *Exounding* (where) which is a word signifying Place, and referred

* Sutcliff in his answer to certain calumnious Petitions, p. 125. bringeth it in for a puritanical Article against the Bishops, *That they did not admit Preachers to Preach without License, and that they did make unpreaching Ministers.* Hereunto he answers, ' That albeit *Ministers* have by their Ordination power to announce the Word by Reading: Yet it is not fit, that every one should expound it, but such as have Learning, and that is known by long

long experience, and must be testified by writing. From which passage I desire it may be observed, that tho' the *Episcoparians* did by *Ordination* confer upon the Persons ordained a Power to announce the *Word of God*; Yet it was meant only by Reading, and not Preaching.

Men, and Naturals or Idiots, no Man been valid: Now if the meaning of the words be, that these (as they then termed them in the Presbyterial Language [if they were such]) though now when it is attributed to Men of equal Demerits, it be reviving) *dumb Dogs* receive *Power to Preach* (as an Act necessary and essential to a Minister,) the Act is as great a Nullity, as the former. Since I am here speaking of this Form of *Ordaining to Preach*, let me tell thee one thing, which I have elsewhere spoke to. They who plead for a Power given to our first *Reformers*, by the *Papists*, to Preach the *Gospel*, at their being made *Dollars*; I would fain know why they do not permit the *Papish Doctors*, and such as are depputed by the same *Commission* that *Luther*, &c. is pretended to have had? Why did not the *Bishops* suffer the *Puritans* (though *ordained to Preach*?) Is it not evident by this Dealing, and by the Laws of the Land, against *Papish Doctors Preaching*; yea, and *Foreign Divises* too, debarring them the Ministry (as M. *Swartif* proveth out of the *Statute 13. Eliz. c. 12.* in his answer to *Calumn. Petition*, p. 111.) that in such *Ordinations* they did not intend a plain Preaching of the *Gospel*, but of it in the determinate Sense of the *Ordainers*? But I shall speak no more, since the Author of that *Abstract* &c. hath shewed that according to Law there are Nullities enough in a Ministry derived through the *Papacy* to overthrow all *Succeſſion*.

That for a Man to Preach, it was from his License that he did receive such Power: This *Stat. Univerſ. Oxon. Tit. 9. ſec. 1.* is further exemplified by the practice of the University of *Oxon*, which hath been 9. ſec. 1. continued Time out of Mind; though it was never in the Power of the University

to ordain: Yet, had they a Power to License
Men to Preach all over England. And this
Power is continued unto them, even unto
this Day, by the Statutes contrived by *Bishop
Laud,* and still in force, for ought I know,
and not murmured against by the *Presbyterians*
ruling there. It is there ordained (in
the *Canterburian Statutes.*) that none be
permitted to sue for such a *License,* who is
not *Master of Arts, Bachelor of Law,* or
Ibid. S. 2. Bachelor of Divinity, each whereof must
have studied in the University Theology
seven Year, and at least once have dispu-
ted in *Divinity* publickly as *Respondent,*
and made four laudable *Sermons* before the
University. After the performance here-
of, he supplicates for a *License* to the Uni-
versity Congregation. That such his per-
formances may suffice for his admittance
to Preach the Word of God throughout
all England. When he has got His Grace,
as they call it, he receives *Testimonial Letters*
by the Authority and Decree of the Congregation,
as follows,

The Chancellor, Masters and Scholars,
of the University of Oxon, to our beloved
in Christ, A. B. Bachelor in Divinity, and
Ibid. S. 3. Fellow of N. Coll. in the University afore-
said, everlasting Salvation in our Lord.
Since all our Studies, Purposes and Actions,
ought to be referred unto the Glory of
God, and the Salvation of our Brethren;
we the Chancellor, Masters and Scholars,
of

of the said University (out of the opinion we have of your Abilities, and upright Life) do by these Presents give you free License and Power to Preach the Word of God, according to that Talent which God hath given you, in any Churches whatsoever, of England, or publick Ecclesiastical Meetings convened for that purpose; and that this License or Power shall last forever, provided you neither do, nor Preach, any thing contrary to the Rites and Canons publickly received and approved of in the Church: In which case, if you commit any such fact, we will that this License of ours be forthwith null and invalid.

Facultatem
by potestas-
tem predi-
candi ver-
bum Dei.

This may suffice to shew the extent of Episcopal Ordination, and the nature of Doctors and Licentiates in the University of Oxon, and probably Paris and Salamanca; there is so great an affinity in the Original Constitutions and Ceremonies of them all, that I am exceeding apt to think that their Licensing was every where of a like nature, and that it did extend no further either in the Collation of Doctoral Degrees, or Licensing to Preach, than that they should Preach the Gospel, as received and expounded in the Church, of which the Licensers and Confessors were Members. But there is one passage more in a Preface of Dr. Gerard Langbaine, late Provost of Qu. College, and Antiquary of the University of Oxon, fixed

Q. Eliz. Injunction, 43. to a Book of Sr. John Cheeke's, called, *The true Subject to the Rebel*, which will influence this Assertion, That *Popish Ordination* did not confer Power to Preach; nor *Episcoparian Constitutions* appropriate it to the Ministry.

Ibid. Injunction, 53. What a learned Ministry shall we think they had under Q. Mary, when many were made Priests being Children, and otherwise utterly unlearned, so they could read, to say Mattens and Mass? And how can we expect it should be much better in the first of Q. Elizabeth, when some Ministers (because they were but mean Readers) are enjoyned to peruse over before once or twice the Chapters and Homilies, to the intent they might read to the better understanding of the People? And what estimate shall we make of their discretion, when because there had grown Offence, and some Slander to the Church, by lack of discreet and sober Behaviour, in many Ministers of the Church, both in choosing their Wives, and in un-

I set this down at large, because I am not sure that these Injunctions (which ought to be read in the church quarterly) are not abolished and nullified; as also to give a pattern to the Tryers of Scandalous Ministers, that not only their Personal Faults, but their Marriages, and Wifes Actions may out them.

in bobnadoes and without the Advice and Allowance, first bad, upon good Examination by the Bishop of the same Diocese, and two Justices of Peace, of the same Shire, dwelling next to the place where the same Woman hath made her next abode before Marriage,

And

' And if any shall do otherwise, that then they
 ' shall not be permitted to Minister either the Word,
 ' or the Sacraments of the Church, nor shall be
 ' capable of an Ecclesiastical Benefice.— And if
 ' any Master, or Dean, or any Head of any Col-
 ' lege, shall purpose to Marry, the same shall
 ' not be allowed, but by such to whom the Visita-
 ' tion of the same doth properly belong. What
 ' rare Preachers shall we imagine they had
 ' in the University at that time, when Mr.
 ' Tavernour of Water-Eaton, high Sheriff of
 ' Oxfordshire, came in pure Charity, not
 ' Ostentation, and gave the Scholars a Ser-
 ' mon in St. Maries, with his Gold Chain
 ' about his Neck, and his Sword by his
 ' Side ; beginning with these Words, *Arri-*
wing at the Mount of St. Maries, in the Stony
Stage where I stand, I have brought you some
fine Biskets, baked in the Oven of Charity, and
carefully conserved for the Chickens of the
Church, the Sparrows of the Spirit, and the
sweet Swallows of Salvation.

Out of this passage, of Dr. Langbain's, you may not only judge in part what Face Protestantcy had first here, where it was settled in a National way at once ; but also see clear proof, That if Children, and such as could only Read, were ordained to be Popish Priests, and Protestant Ministers, how far Preaching is from having been the chief, or indeed any Act of their Call. The action of Mr. Sheriff, being not Censured, is a witness for Lay-preaching : It is not to be imagined that so Considerable a piece of Magistracy,

stracy, of no ordinary Qualifications (as you may guess by the Prece of his Sermon) in those days, should violate the appointments of the then Church. You may also observe the caution of our *Independents*; who will own the *Parochial Assemblies* for true Churches of Christ, because they (some few in some corner of *England*, *Scotland*, or *Ireland*, they know not where possibly) were once rightly gathered, though the whole Election and Institution of them is by the Papists avowed to be from them; and the mentioned Order of Priests, as in the times of Q. *Mary*, would (one should think) create an *Intercision*, or whatever name they will give it.

See the conclusion added to this Edition.

From all that hath been said, it is clear, That a Popish Doctor of School Divinity is not thereby in holy Orders, or as such a part of the Clergy; nor hath he power to administer the Sacraments, nor derives any succession from the Apostles; nor is he ordained, but created or promoted to his Doctorship; nor that, by any Spiritual Ecclesiastical Canons and Prescription, but Academicall Statutes.

It is likewise clear, nor can any Man deny it, who is versed in the Promoters of Geneva-Discipline of old, That a Doctor of Divinity, in the Reformed Sense, is no Clergy-man, but of the better sort of School Masters; nor are they (by any model of Discipline that ever I yet saw or heard of) ordained, or claimers of an Apostolick Succession, but preferred by the Magistrate.

Ibid. Junium. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1. & 5:

Whence

Whence it doth necessarily follow, That whosoever hath no other Title than what an University Degree of Doctor doth give them; they are no Clergy-men, nor in Orders; nor can they, by virtue of such their Degree, discharge the duty of *Presbyters* or *Ministers* at all: They cannot by virtue thereof pretend to a Succession to, or a being of old-descending *Clergy*. Nor can they Constitute and Ordain others, not only to be of the Clergy, but not to be Doctors, but it is the University intitl'd to do it; out of the University they have no Power, no nor in it singly to do such acts. Nor do I believe, that the present University in *England*, would allow any to challenge such a liberty at home, as is by this claim imposed on the Reformers.

It is also evident, That a Minister, whose principal and distinguishing Work is to Preach, supposing the Validity of Popish and Episcopal Orders (of which I have given you an account already) though ordained by them, cannot claim a Succession from them to such a Ministry: It is an Usurpation or Innovation, to which neither of them did ordain him. But that a Minister, being no Bishop, should erect such a Preaching-Ministry, and ordain others thereunto by virtue of a Popish or Episcopal previous Ordination of his own, is such a detestable Cheat, that I wonder at the infolency of those *Presbyterians* that act so. The Orders which they received were those of a Romish

or

or English Presbyter, neither of which by Ecclesiastical Constitutions had any Power to Ordain others. For, from *Jerom's* time (I would not, by this limitation of Time, be understood to prejudice the more Ancient Claim of the Bishops; but from what I say, as there is clear proof, so it is sufficient for my purpose) I say, that from before *Jerom's* time, Ordination was the appropriated Act of a Bishop: Which, whether it were an Usurpation or not, let them dispute. And let them make their Assertion never so plain, *viz.* *That Presbyters in times of yore, did and could lawfully Ordain Presbyters,* yet will the consequences, as to their so doing, be of no more validity, than if a *Roman Praetor* in *Justinian's* days should have challenged that Jurisdiction, which the *Praetors* of the Common-Wealth, or newly Established Empire of *Rome* formerly had exercised, notwithstanding that succeeding Emperors had appointed a *Præfetus Praetorio*, whose power had diminished, and almost rendered insignificant, the Authority of after-*Praetors*: Or if our present English Grand-Juries should claim a power (to the prejudice of Parliaments of a later erection) of determining Law, as well as matter of Fact; because (possibly) in the *Saxon* times, a number of Men, called by some such Name, did practise some such Power.

Thus I have done with the busyness of the *Call of the Ministry*, nor need I say any more: Yet to let you see what Impostors these

these *Presbyterians* are, let me tell you this, that their Discipline, as it is now practised and maintained, is an *up-start thing*, not so much as bottomed on the *Geneva-Reformers*. Did these publick Cheats ever hear, amongst the *Beyond-Sea-Reformers*, of a *Catholick visible Church of Christ*, and of a *Ministry* that was not constituted in its Being and Essence of a *Church-Ministry*, by the Election of the particular Churches? ‘Do not they say, that the Band is only mutual betwixt the Minister and that particular Congregation whereof he is Minister; and that one Congregation cannot appoint Ministers for another? And therefore when they are out of their Congregations, they are no Ministers, nor were acknowledged for such by the *Episcopal Divines*. If any of them shall engage hereafter in a discourse of the Ministry, I desire they would acquaint us with their *Genealogy*, and what Foundation they have to their Ordaining Ministers, as they do; where is that *Election* of the People which they avow to be necessary? Shall two or three forward *Presbyterians* in a Parish bring down a Fellow, made up of Ignorance and Malice, who hath only been thumm'd at *London, Bracktry or Dentry*, and he thereby become Pastor to a *Parish* [Church] made up of *Anabaptists* and *Quakers*, as well as *Episcoparians*? If this can be justified out of the first Reformers, or reconciled to their Principles, I profess myself very little conversant in their Writings.

*Matth. Step-
cliff's answer
to certain
Calumnious
Petitions, p.
111.*

IX. Whether the Arguments of the first Reformers, about their Vocation, do not justifie any that shall take upon them to Preach? (a) And in particular that of Morny du Plessis de Eccles. c. 14. p. 243. Whether Dominicus Soto do not prove it lawful jure naturæ? (b) And yet he is a Papist.

* *Pbil. Morny du Plessis*, being urged about the Call of the first Reformers, saith, *Such Intercatories are but the Tergiversations of Men already convinced in their own Judgments, who dare not abide the Trial; just as Zedekiah the false Prophet replied to Micaiah, 1 Kings 22. 24. When went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak to thee? And then the Pharisees, Thou art the Son of a Carpenter, who sent thee? To whom we might determine the Controversie by Christ's own word: The words which we speak, they bear witness of us. The Jews prided themselves in their long descent from Abraham, and being his Successors. But what says Christ? You are, indeed, the Seed of Abraham, but yet you are of your Father the Devil, John 8. And Paul tells us, 2 Thess. 2. Let no Man seduce you, for Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God. Having permisid these things, Morny thus argues: When a Town is on fire, or assaulted by the Enemy, by scalado in the night; if any body should raise the sleepy Watchmen, or give an alarm to the Corps d'gard, whether stranger or citizen, none ask by what authority he doth it, but all run for Water to quench the Fire, or to the Walls to repulse the Enemy; Men enquire*

enquire into the case, whether his discovery be
 true, and do not arraign or implead him other-
 wise ; yea, such a Man receives thanks for his
 timely discovering the danger. But we (faith-
 he) alarm the Christian World, by discovering
 how Antichrist sits in the Temple of God ; we
 offer to prove it, yet are we not regarded, nor
 our Reasons listened unto ; but they clamour,
 Who are you ? and punish us more heavily
 than if we were Traitors. Should any Gover-
 nour of a Citadel demean himself thus in cases
 of intelligence ? Would not he soon be surprised
 by the Enemy ? And would he not be condemned
 by his General or Governours for neglect ? In
 the Conspiracy of Cataline, the Roman Senate
 derived that Intelligence, which prevented the
 Plot, from an Harlot ; when the Capital was
 stormed by the Gaules, they took an alarm
 from the Geese. Let us therefore be never so
 mean, we ought to be afforded Audience. The
 Question is not, Who are We ? But, Whether
 that be Antichrist ? Seek not into the Qua-
 lity of the Relators, but the Truth of the Re-
 lation : Christ was promised to the Jews, but
 revealed to the Shepherds ; these Shepherds
 divulged it among the People. If we may
 credit our Adversaries, those Men ought to have
 been questioned for it. The Brethren of Ephie-
 sus should also have ejected Un-commissioned
 Apollos for Preaching, but they received him,
 commanding his Zeal, desired him to pass into
 Achaia, and wrote to the Brethren to receive
 him. — At the Dreadful Day, when Men are
 to give an account of their Talents, it will not
 be

‘ be a sufficient reply for any to say, they wanted
 ‘ Ecclesiastical Vocation, when they wanted not
 ‘ the great inducement of Christian Charity to
 ‘ employ that Talent, which was given them to
 ‘ profit with. The French Ministers, against
 whom Cardinal Perron writ, argue thus,
 ‘ In the Old Testament some were extraordina-
 ‘ rily raised to instruct the People: Why may it
 ‘ not be so under the New? The same motives
 ‘ are still remaining. Moreover they say,
 That it is not to be expected that Antichrist
 should commission Men to destroy himself; see
 Champney de vocat. Ministr. In fine, the
 Papists think they have sufficiently refuted the
 Call of the first Reformers, by shewing how all
 Sects may use the same Plea.

(b) ‘ The Church of Christ primarily, and
 ‘ likewise every Man, hath a Right, both
 ‘ Divine and Natural, to preach the Gospel
 ‘ every where. This is proved, First, from
 ‘ that of Mark 16. 15. Go ye into all the World,
 ‘ and preach the Gospel to every Creature. And
 ‘ Mat. 28. 18, 19. All Power is given to me
 ‘ in Heaven and in Earth: Go ye therefore and
 ‘ teach all Nations, &c. As if he had said,
 ‘ That Power which I have, do I give unto
 ‘ you: But he had Power to preach in all
 ‘ the World, therefore such Power did he
 ‘ give unto Believers. Secondly, By the Law
 ‘ of Nature every Man hath the liberty to
 ‘ teach others, and perswade them unto the
 ‘ Truth; therefore as far as Perswasion ex-
 ‘ tends, he may transact with every body.
 ‘ Which is further confirmed thus: Every
 ‘ Man

‘ Man may instruct others in what is the
 ‘ Law of Nature; nor can be be deprived of
 ‘ that Right: Therefore he may teach also
 ‘ Gospel-Trutbs, since they are not of an in-
 ‘ ferior consequence. I do not say that he
 ‘ may compel them, or convince them there-
 ‘ in; for supernatural things are not to be
 ‘ evinced out unto Men, but may be ex-
 ‘ plained: And to do this, every one hath
 ‘ a right; the case is clear. *F. Dom. Soto.*
 ‘ in 4. sentent. distinct. 5. qu. 1. art. 10. p.
 ‘ 154. c. 1.

A Discourse of the Ministry out of Luther, &c. With an Apology for the Quakers.

IN the Constitution of the *Clergy*, there is
 to be considered but these two things,
 The *Sacerdotal* or *Priestly* Part; and the *Mi-
 nisterial* or *Preaching* Part. Of the first (to
 say nothing of that, how the first Reformers
 did condemn the division of the Saints of
 God into the *Clergy* and *Laity*, as being pro-
 fane) it is *Luther's* positive Judgment, and
 of which he bids us to be certain, and not
 suffer our selves, if we be Christians, any way
 to be drawn aside thenceunto, ‘ That there is no
 ‘ visible and outward Priesthood under the
 ‘ New Testament, but what hath been erect-
 ‘ ed by Satan, through the deceits of Men. *Luther do-
 abrog. misf.
 privatis. In-
 tn op. edit.
 Witteberge
 s. 2. f. 246.
 c. 1.*

' The only Priesthood is that of Christ's,
 ' when he offered up himself for our Sins,
 ' *the just for the unjust,* (1 Pet. 3. 18.) and by
 ' that one Oblation did consummate for ever
 the Saints, (Heb. 10. 14.) This Priesthood
 ' is spiritual, and common to all Christians;
 ' nor need we any Priest or Mediator besides
 ' Christ. Every Priest (saith the Apostle,
 ' Heb. 5. 1. where he distinguisheth not
 ' as Men distinguish) is constituted, that he
 ' may pray for the People, and instruct
 them: But every Christian prays to God in
 ' Christ, and hath free access to him himself,
 ' Rom. 5. 2. And every one of them is taught
 ' of God, Isa. 54. 13. And all thy Children shall
 ' be taught of God. And Jer. 31. 34. They
 ' shall not teach every one his Brother, nor every
 ' one his Neighbour, saying, Know the Lord;
 ' For they shall all know me from the least to the
 greatest. And Isa. 11. 9. The Earth is filled
 ' with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters
 ' of the Sea. Hereupon Christ himself, by
 Application of these Promises, saith, John
 6. 45. It is written by the Prophets, They shall
 ' be all taught of God.

These Testimonies do clearly evacuate
 all visible Priesthood-performances, by making
 those acts to be Universal, which make up
 the Essence and Being of a Priesthood, viz.
 Access to God by Prayer, and the Instructing
 of others. For what need, what use have
 we of a Priest, who have no need of any
 new Mediator or Teacher? Shall we in-
 stitute an Office or Function without any
 employ?

employment? There is not any Mediator,
nor any Teacher of Christians, besides Christ
himself.

It would be tedious to transcribe what he farther adds, by way of proof, out of 1 Pet. 2. v. 3, 4, 5, 6. and Rev. 5. v. 10. It being undeniably evident, that he disavows any peculiar Officiating Priesthood to be in the New Testament, calling all such as pretend thereunto (and reply by distinctions unto the Texts alledged, whereby to elude their force) *Idolatrous, Sacrilegious, Profane, Hypocritical Persons, intolerable Burdens of the Earth, and useth much of that Language; which, when used by a well-meaning Quaker, to the same ends, is termed Insupportable Reviling.* He tells them their distinctions and answers at *Additions to the Word of God,* and so from Satan. For if it be but a ^{c. 2.}
Man's Testament, yet if it be confirmed, no Man disanulleteth or addeth thereunto, Gal. 3. 15. much more if it be the *Testament of God.* And farther, to disprove such Oppositions of Men, he saith, Men ought to have recourse unto the ensuing Texts. *Prov. 30.6.* Add thou not to his [God's] words, lest be reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. And *Deut. 4. 2.* Ye shall not add unto the word which I have spoken, nor shall you diminish from it. And 1 Pet. 4. 11. Let him that speaks, speak as the *Oracles of God.* In fine (saith he), what need I repeat all that the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles, have said concerning the Works, Doctrines and Traditions

' ditions of Men? It is manifest, *John* 8.47.

' *He that is of God, beareth God's words.* And

' *John* 3.31. *He that is of the Earth, speaks*

Ibid. f. 247. e. 2. ' *from the Earth.* — It is an horrible thing

' which I am going to say, and I wish I

' might be found a liar, but it is too true:

' It is an Irrefragable Verity, that there are

' no Priests in Holy Scripture contra-distinct

' from the *Laity*; and they which have not

' their Establishment from the plain Word

' of God, have no Call of God; which is

' it not all one as if they were *from the*

' *Devil?* For none assumes this honour unto him,

' but who is called of God, as Aaron, *Heb.* 5.4.

These Arguments, as much as they are ex-

ploded now, and this Language, as contumelious and bitter as it is now thought,

was the bottom of the Reformation; and those, upon whose Foundation we now stand, did venture their *Lives*, their *Fortunes*,

their *Souls*, hereupon. From these Con-

victions did *Luther* cry out, O fuge, frater,

Ibid. f. 240. e. 1. & desere hoc perditum Sacerdotium Papistarum!

Fly Brother, and relinquish this corrupt

Priesthood of the Papists! As for the Teach-

ing part of the Priesthood, whereof it seems

(though not appropriated, yet) a part, and to that end is alledged by *Luther* [and

Dr. Featly, for a distinction betwixt Clergy

and *Laity*] *The Priests Lips shall preserve Knowledge, and the People shall seek for the Law at his mouth*, Mal. 2.7. Here it is, saith *Luther*,

that the Popish Clergy pride themselves, boasting also of that, *He who beareth you, beareth*

me ; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me,
Matt. 10. That *Holy Man* is positive herein, *Ibid.*

that as the *Priesthood* is a *Fiction*, so is this
Ministry of the Word *Fictions*, *Novel*, and *Sacri-*
legious ; the *true* and *only Ministry of the Word*,

being *common to all Christians*. ‘ For so saith *Paul*,
‘ 2 Cor. 3. 6. Who bath
‘ made us fit Ministers of
‘ the New Testament, not

‘ of the Letter, but of the Spirit. This is spoken
‘ of all Christians universally, to shew they
‘ are all Ministers of the Spirit. A Minister
‘ of the Spirit, is one who teacheth the
‘ Doctrine of Saving Grace : A Minister of
‘ the Letter, is one who declareth the Law ;
‘ The latter appertained to *Moses*, the for-
‘ mer to *Christ*. So *Peter* saith unto all
‘ Christians, *That you may declare the Power of*
‘ *him* *who bath called you from Darkness to*
‘ *Light*. What Christian, what Believer, is
‘ not called from Darkness to Light ? But it
‘ is the Right, and Priviledge, yea, Duty of
‘ such, to declare the Power of him that
‘ hath so called them.

‘ We do grant this indeed, that many
‘ ought not to speak together, though all
‘ have the same Right and Liberty to speak ;
‘ for *Paul* was the main Speaker, *Acts* 14.
‘ and whilst he spake, *Barnabas* held his
‘ Tongue. But doth it therefore follow,
‘ that *Barnabas* had no Right, or was not
‘ under a Necessity of Teaching ? I say with
‘ the *Apostle*, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be*

This Opinion *be derived from the*
Waldenses, Bohemians, &c. whose
Assertion it was, That it was free for
all to preach the Word of God, Ulster
de success. Eccl. c. 6.

' done according to Decency and Order. But
 ' hereby the Universal Extent of the Ministry
 ' is not destroyed, but confirmed; for it is
 ' therefore necessary that Order be observed
 ' in Speaking, because all have power to
 ' speak: If one only were to speak, and that
 ' by right, what needed the Apostle to men-
 ' tion Order?

It were endless, at least inconsistent with
 the design of this Treatise, to set down all
 which Luther disputes in that Book: Not
 far after, it follows, ' We will add this fur-
 ' ther Proof, which was also touched upon
 ' before, John 6. 45. They shall all be taught
 ' of God. If all are taught of God, then not
 ' only the Shaveling Priests; yea, who are
 ' more Aliens to the Teachings of God, than
 ' they who would be the sole Teachers amongst
 ' Men, those Idol-Shepherds, anointed Rogues,
 ' rather than Priests? If all are taught of God,
 ' then have all the Spirit, and in-dwelling
 ' Word of God. Wherefore not only the
 ' Laity, but the Pope [or any other imposed
 ' and imposing Ministry] must be subjected to
 them that are taught of God, unless they
 ' have an Exemption from being subject to
 the Word of God and his Spirit; for to
 him that is taught of God, the whole
 World, and the Angels from Heaven, must
 give way, and assent, because such Obey-
 ' lance or Opposition, reflects upon God that
 teaches him, and not the Man.

And yet these Seven-foldly-mad Idols of the
 Pope's setting up, say, that the Pope is
 above

above the Church: [They say the same in effect, who urge their Expositions to be received by Men of a differing Judgment] for is not this to say, that the Pope is above

Mr. Henderson in his Papers to C. R. refuseth that the Scriptures be expounded according to the Fathers, because thereby the Fathers were exalted above the Scripture. Why then are we pressed for not receiving it with their Expositions who are no Fathers?

them *who are taught of God?* But who can be above those that are *taught of God*, but who *exalts himself above God?* And so the saying of the Apostle is fulfilled, *The Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, and is worshipped.*

‘ But it may perhaps be objected, That every one hath not a Right to Preach, seeing that some Christians are enjoyned to be silent. Let your Women keep silence in the Church; for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but to be under Obedience. Wherefore the Ministry cannot be Universal. I answer: So it is not permitted that *Mutes*, and such as are not able to deliver themselves through any Impediment, should speak. This doth not deprive them of their Right, but debar them the Exercise thereof, which it is fitting they should put in practise, who are best able to do so, to preserve Decency and Order. Thus Timothy is commanded to depute unto the *ibid. f. 245.
C. 1.* discharge of the Ministry such as were fit; they who are not gifted and qualified, are not injured, if another perform that part. Women are not absolutely forbid to Speak

or Teach, but in the Church, [the Apostle writes to a Church of God, so that this Precept binds not to Silence in a place or Assembly that is no Church of God, however it be called] to wit, for the Preservation of Decency and Order, in a place where there are many able to speak, and ready to do so. Nor doth the Apostle prohibit this of his own head, but he citeth the Law, saying, That they ought to be subject, as the Law commands. By which Law he was assured, that the Spirit of God did not contradict it self, so as by the Universality of the Ministry to exalt that Sex above Men, to whom he had otherwise subjected them; yea, consonantly hereto, in such Assemblies, God being mindful of his Injunction, will command the Spirit, which breatheth when, how, and where it listeth, to inspire Men rather than Women, when both are present together. How else can the Saying of Paul be reconciled to that of Joel? Doth it not interfere with that Prophecy of the Holy Ghost, And your Daughters shall Prophecy? Joel 2. 28. Acts 2. 17. So Philip had four Daughters, Virgins, which did Prophecie, Acts 21. 9. And Miriam the Sister of Moses was a Prophetess; and so was Deborah, which instructed Baruch; and Huldah the Prophetess was sought unto by King Hezekiah. In fine, The Song of the Virgin Mary is become the Song of the whole Church. And it is said by the fame

same Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 11. 5. Every Woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head. It is only a regard to Order and Decency which enjoyns Women to be silent in the Church, where Men also are assembled and speak; but if no Men do speak, it is a Duty, a Necessity, that is incumbent upon Women, not to be silent.

Upon these premises (I set down but a part of his words now) doth *Luther* thus conclude, We do, by Divine Authority, with confidence and freedom of Spirit, pronounce and declare [to the Popish Priests, Predecessors to our Clergy, and all such as introduce a restrained Preaching] for so much as you do reign without a Divine Warrant, *you are the Ministers of Satan*, and your Ministry, together with your Priesthood, was introduced by Satan into the World, to destroy the *only true Ministry* of the Spirit. For therefore did you condemn this Opinion in *John Hus*, that the World might not be instructed in the Truth by *any Saint*, but all might be confined up under Satan through your corrupt Ministry. Hence it is that the things you teach are but conformable to that Ministry of yours. You have condemned and extinguished the Gospel, you teach your own and *Aristotle's Lyes*, and the Spirit of Satan prevails in all your Books and Doctrines.—*Præstat publicum Ibid. f. 250.*
lenonem esse aut latronem esse, quam bujus generis

generis sacerdotem. It is better to be a common Pander, or Robber, than such a Priest, as our Clergy must avow to have been the Successors of Christ, and to have derived a Function to them.

Nor is this a rash and hasty Assertion of *Luther's*, but such as is avowed by him some Years after, in another Treatise of his about the Ministry, to the *Bohemian Protestants*; they had cast off the *Popish Doctrine*, yet did still preserve reverence for their Orders, they being only to be conferred by a *Bishop*; and they having none such in their number, they did usually send Men into the Popish Territories, to purchase, for a Sum of Money, Ordination from some *Bishop*: To dehort them from this usage, *Luther* wrote a Book to them, informing them how unworthy and unbecoming an Act it was, for the Followers of *John Huss*, and *Jerom of Prague*, to have recourse to him who had burned them, and would burn as well as brand the *Bohemians* for Hereticks: How ridiculous, to *resist him openly*, and yet *privately to recur to him for Orders*, execrable and sacrilegious Orders; to profess *Christ*, and yet so far to honour the *bloody Enemy of Christ*, as to *kiss his hands*, and seek for from his Mouth, the *Breatnings of the Holy Ghost*, who breathes nothing but *Destruction to the Saints of God*? It were more equitable (saith he) that you should not endure the Name of such Persons; if *Paul* enjoyns you to esloign your selves from the *Whore-master* and

*De Instit.
Minist. inter
op. Lutheri
t.2.f.367.e.1*

‘ and Drunkard, How much more ought every Professor of Christ to decline and hate this Abomination, this destructive Scarlet-Whore, who maketh the Kings of the Earth drunk with the Cup of her Fornications? Then he tells them how *every Christian* is, by virtue of Christ’s being our High Priest, partaker of the Sacerdotal Dignity, and advanced to be a King and Priest, and that other Priesthood there is none in Scripture, but what is common to all that are Members of Christ. To teach, to preach, to baptise, to break Bread, to bind and loose [declaratively, which is all that Protestants attribute to Ministers] to pray for others, to offer [themselves up a reasonable] Sacrifice, to judge of Doctrines, and try the Spirits if they be of God. These Acts, how great and royal soever they be, he proves at large to be communicated to all Believers, and not confined to any Order of Men.

‘ 1 Cor. 14. 26. When you come together, **every one of you** bath a Psalm, bath a Doctrine, bath a Tongue, bath a Revelation, bath an Interpretation: And afterwards v. 31. For ye may all prophesie one by one, that all may learn, and all be exhorted. Tell me now, what is meant by *every one*? Who are those *all*?

‘ Doth that Universality extend no further than the number of *Shorn Priests*? It is clear and evidently proved, that the Ministry of c. 2.

‘ the Word, being the highest Office in the Church of Christ, as it is but one in kind, so it is common to all Christians, not by Right

Luther de
Ministr. Inter-
op. T. 2. f. 363

Right alone, but special Precept. So that
 against those Proofs [which are no other
 than are daily alledged for *liberty of Pro-*
pheyng by the Saints of God amongst us,
 which oppose a limited Ministry] an In-
 finity of Fathers, innumerable Councils,
 everlasting Usage, immemorial Prescripti-
 ons, the whole World imbodyed into one
 Catholick Testimony (though this be the
Hay and Stubble whereon these *Saravelings*
 do build) all are of no validity.—Ra-
 ther than be subjected to Popishly-ordained
 Ministers (for, Reader, you must know
 that these Priests were Protestants in *Do-*
ctrine, and derived only Orders from Popish
 Bishops) it were better that every Master
 of a Family, and safer for him (and I do
 boldly counsel it) that he read the Gospel
 to his Relations at home, and Baptise his
 young ones, (which he is permitted to do,
 by the Usage, as well as Consent, of the
 whole World;) and if several Houses, or
 a whole City, or several Cities, should
 agree to do thus, though (to Eternity)
 they should never have a Priest among
 them; yet, without doubt, Christ would
 be in the midst of them, and own them
 for his Church.

Ibid. f. 365.
c. 1, 2.

It is true indeed, that in the Conclusion
 he tells them, that in a gathered formed
 Church of Christians, all of which are en-
 dowed with the same Liberty, Order is to
 be preserved; and that, to prevent Confu-
 sion, it is necessary that one or more be
 appointed,

appointed, not by a Popishly-ordained Clerk, but by the Assembly, for the constant Performance of the Work. But out of such an Assembly of Christians, where every one hath a Right to do it, any one may discharge the Duty of a Minister. So that it is evident, where any Christian is under such Convictions, that this or that Assembly or number of Men is deceived and estranged from the ways of Godliness, it is no breach of Order for him to exercise a Ministry; nor is he by the Protestant Principles to be otherwise refuted, than by shewing that He, (and not They,) is in an Error. None ought to impose upon any because they are Ministers:

*To be a Christian, is (I think, faith
Luther) to have the Spirit of Christ, who
will teach him all things, and who partici-
pates of the All-instructing Unction.* In a
word, a Christian is so assured of what he
is to believe, or not believe, that he is
ready to dye in Confirmation thereof.
With what Face then can a Papist [or any
else] tell a Lay-Christian, that he ought
to believe them, and not himself? What is
this else, than to challenge a Preheminence
over the very Spirit of God, and as it were
to say, though you are a Christian, and
partake of the Holy Ghost, whereby you
are ascertained what to believe, and what
not; yet because the Holy Ghost is infe-
riour to us, and we are much more learned
and knowing than he, therefore he must
be subjected to us, and hear us? It is fur-
ther

*Bid. f. 371.
c. 2.*

*Bid. f. 371.
c. 1.*

ther the Judgment of *Luther*, (not to acquaint you with the Practice of more ancient Christians) that as this Minister is to be elected by the Church, or assembled Christians, so he may be upon occasion Deposed and Excommunicated by them, and another substituted in his stead. And for the Validity of a Ministry so constituted, his Argument is, 'What two or three shall do, being met together in Christ his Name, and he being in the midst of them, may be esteemed as sufficiently warranted by Christ. And if we seek for Examples, behold *Apollos*, *Act*s 18. of whom we read, that without any Call or Ordination he came to *Ephesus*, and did fervently teach, and powerfully convince the *Jews*. By what Right, I pray, did he discharge the Ministry of the Word, but by that Universal and common Appointment, *1 Cor.* 14. 30. If any thing be revealed to another that setteth by, let the first hold his peace: And *1 Pet.* 2. 9. That you should shew forth the Praises of him, who hath called you out of Darkness into his marvellous Light? And this Man afterwards became an *Apostle*, without any Accessional Ordination, not only being Serviceable in the Ministry of the Word, but much benefitting those which already believed. Thus is every Christian obliged to do, if he see that there be occasion, and that he be able, though the Multitudes should not call him thereunto. How much more then, if he be intreated and called

called thereto by the Fraternity? Another example we find in *Stephen and Philip*, who were Only appointed for the Service of the Tables: And yet the one did very great Miracles and Signs amongst the People, and Disputed in the Synagogue, and Confuted them by the Spirit: The other converted the *Samaritans*, and went about to *Anthus and Cæsarea*: I would fain know by what Authority or Right? Truly they were not entreated nor called by any to such Performances, but acted upon a General Account, whilst the Door was open to them, and they saw the Peoples Ignorance, and want of the sincere Truth, did render such their performances necessary. How much more would they have done it, if they had been desired thereunto by any?

Thus much I thought fit to represent unto the World, out of *Luther*, that from him, who was, I may say, the Founder of the Ministry, we might understand the Nature thereof: He who shall compare what I have set down, with what the Original Books contain, will easily satisfie himself, that if I have either injured *Luther* or my Reader, it is by parcelling out what might have been exhibited in whole Discourses. But what I have alledged will suffice for the end alledged; and I must desire leave so to quote one writer, as that I may not omit another.

Hadrianus Saravia (a judicious Writer)
 speaking concerning the Call of the first Re-
 formers, saith, That they needed not have
 recourse, as he thinks, to any Extraordina-
 ry Call: ‘ For, that any Christian versed in
De divers. ‘ the Scriptures, might, and was bound, to
grad. minist. ‘ Teach and Assert the Truth, and to Dis-
o. 2. ‘ prove false Doctrines about the Son of
 God, and Errors in other points of Faith.
 ‘ He also thinks that *Ephes. 4. 11.* by *Teach-*
 ‘ *ers* that are said to be given, is not meant
 ‘ the same with our *Ministers*, nor yet *Pa-*
 ‘ *stors*, nor such as *Beza* (I think, and o-
 ‘ *thers*) would have in each Parish, one to
 ‘ Exound, who should be the Teacher or
 ‘ Doctor, and another to apply the Word
 ‘ by Exhortation, Consolation, &c. But since
 Teaching there is a Gift of God, he sup-
 poseth by them to be designed ‘ such as ha-
 ‘ ving knowledge of the Ways and Myste-
 ‘ ries of God, do by Word or Writing
 ‘ Edifie the Church of God, of what con-
 ‘ dition soever they be. Such he reputes
Solomon (who is called in the Scripture,
Ibid. c. 26. Ecclesiastes or the *Preacher*) and *David* to
Ibid. have been. ‘ Yea, saith he, though a Wo-
 ‘ man be prohibited to Teach in the Church;
 ‘ yet may She, if She be able, Write and
 ‘ Instruct privately her
 ‘ Domesticks. He saith,
 ‘ that though the Primitive Christians had no
 ‘ Schools at first, yet in
 ‘ their Churches did they
 ‘ permit

Beza, in his Reply to that Chap-
 ter, is so severe, that he doth not
 think it lawful for any who is no
 Pastor, though he be learned, or
 seem so, to Teach or Write about
 Divinity.

permits Doctors and Prophets (Lay-
 Teachers) to speak publickly; to whose
 Doctrine, if Sound, the Auditors were no
 less obliged, than if they had been Pastors,
 though they had not the Power of Ex-
 communicating the Refractory. In the
 Church at *Corinth*, *Stephanus*, *Fortunatus*
 and *Achimus*, are said to have taught, yet
 doth it not seem that they were Bishops or
 Presbyters; so that we ought not to won-
 der, if the Reforming of Corruptions in
 that Church, were not enjoyned them;
 nor they reproved for not redressing them:
 They were necessitated to endure what
 they could not remedy till the coming of
Paul. In the Epistle to *Titus*, one might
 wonder why *Zenas* the Lawyer, and *Apol-*
los, were not joyned in the same Com-
 mission with *Titus*, they being in *Creet*,
 and *Paul* knew of their being there; un-
 less that they were only Teachers or Do-
 ctors: Nor was it only in Extraordinary
 Cases, and upon the absence of other In-
 structors, that the Ancient Church did
 permit Lay-men to Teach the People open-
 ly. *Euseb.* l. 6. c. 13. faith concerning
Origen, *That being not yet Presbyter, he taught*
School at Cæsarea, and was desired by the Bi-
shops there not only to discuss Controversies, but
to explain the Scriptures in the publick Assem-
blies of the Churcb. Whereat, if *Demetrios*
Bishop of Alexandria, were offended, and
 reproved him for so doing, yet we are to
 know that he did it out of Emulation,

‘ and that the same Man had before sent
 ‘ Origen into *Arabia* to Teach the Gospel,
 ‘ and not disallowed his being Catechist at
 ‘ *Alexandria*. It was out of Envy then that
 ‘ he did reprove the Bishops for permitting
 ‘ a Lay-man publickly to expound the Holy Scri-
 ‘ tures. To which Exception of his, *Alex-*
 ‘ *ander Bishop of Jerusalem*, and *Theodotus*
 ‘ *Bishop of Caesarea*, did thus answer; Where-
 ‘ as you add in your Letters, that it was never
 ‘ used of before, nor practised, that Lay-men,
 ‘ in the Audience of Bishops, should Dispute and
 ‘ Explain the Scriptures, therein you seem, to me,
 ‘ to aver things evidently False: For where there
 ‘ are fitting and able Persons, who may be help-
 ‘ ful to the Brethren in the propagation of the
 ‘ Word, there they are desired by the Holy Bishops,
 ‘ that they would Instruct the People in the Go-
 ‘ spel: As at Larand, Euelpis was intreated
 ‘ by Neon: At Iconium, Paulinus by Celsus;
 ‘ and Theodorus by Atticus at Synnade; all
 ‘ which were of the number of the pious Brother-
 ‘ hood, and it is probable, tho’ we do not know it,
 ‘ that the same is and hath been practised else-
 ‘ where. Thus far Eusebius.

Vld. Nic-
 phor. l. 5.
 s. 14.

De divers.
 grad. mini-
 ster. in def.
 adv. Bezae,
 s. 2.

Thus we see that there are more Prece-
 dents than *Edesias* and *Frumentius*, and the
Woman who converted the *Iberians*, for Lay-
preaching; nor is it only unquestionable
 (with *Seravia*) that a private Christian may
 instruct Infidels (And why not such as he
 esteems for no other, or to be in an Error?)
 if none else doth, by vertue of the General
 Commission, to *Love his Neighbour*: But that
 the

the Magistrate may constitute, notwithstanding a *Clergy* in being, private Christians to Instruct the People and Preach. ‘ And if the ordinary Pastors be Corrupt, all that are able ought to Instruct or Strengthen the Faithful, by their Writings; Nobles, Princes, and common People, all may turn Divines, to Write, Exhort, or otherwise Edifie: Yea, in a general Corruption (of which every Man is to satisfie himself, and so to act) whoever he be that is able to defend and illustrate the Truth, if he have opportunity, he is bound to put out the Talent of his Master to Use; if he neglect to do so, in the Judgment of God, he shall incur the same Condemnation with that Servant, who did Napkin-up, and bury his Talent; and so be guilty of not having confessed Christ before Men. They who are not so far induced as to Preach, ought to Write; as *Justin Martyr*, *Abenagoras*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, being private Christians; and *Boethius* a Noble Man; as also of late, *Mornay du Plessis*, and others have done.

*Seravia in
def. cap. se-
cundi adv.
Bezan.*

I could here cite many more Passages of the same nature with what I have already alledged; but it hath been fully debated betwixt the *Independents* and *Presbyterians* of late, in several Books, viz. That to Preach, it is not necessary any one be ordained by *solemn imposition of Hands*, but it is a Moral Duty, incumbent on All that are Able and Gifted, to Instruct others, and Preach unto them;

them. This hath been largely and judiciously debated by Mr. Petto, and Mr. Woodall, in a Book called, *The Preacher Sent*, and the late Defence thereof: But I shall particularly fix upon what Dr. Owen lays down in his *Latine Exercitations* against the *Quakers*:

Exerc. 2. Where he speaks concerning the *Interpreting of the Scriptures*, he lays it down for an indubitable Truth, and which hath been proved to be such by the Reformed Divines:

' That the Only, Publick, Authentick, and
 ' Infallible Interpreter of the Holy Scripture, is
 ' he who is the Author of them, from the
 ' breathing of whose Spirit, it derives all
 ' its Verity, Perspicuity and Authority. This
 ↗ Author and Interpreter of the Scripture is
 ' the Spirit, partly speaking in the Scri-
 ' pture, and plainly setting down his Mind
 ' therein; and if there be any doubtful or
 ' obscure passages therein, explaining him-
 ↗ self by that Analogy or Harmony of the
 ' whole Doctrine which is found therein,
 ' and partly infusing a Spiritual Light into
 ' our Hearts, whereby we may be led into
 ' the knowledge of all necessary Truths re-
 ' vealed in the Word.

↗ And therefore as there never was any visible
 ' Judge of Faith appointed by Christ, so nei-
 ' ther is there any use or need of such an Arbi-
 ' trator.

' Secondly, That every private Christian
 ' hath it as a Duty incumbent upon him,
 ' to inquire into the Mind of God, in the
 ' Scriptures, that is, to seek into the mean-
 ' ing

‘ing of them by all requisite means, and
‘to expound them to himself for his own
‘Edification: For, *The Just shall live by
‘his Faith.*

As for the power of Teaching others, and Preaching to them (I speak not of such as are imbodyed in a *Congregational Church*, what a private Person amongst them may do at the request of the Brotherhood: That a Gifted Member may lawfully Teach publickly in such Circumstances as Violate not Order and Decency, is proved by the said Dr. §. 12, 13.) that a private Christian without any Ordination may Preach publickly, I think you may learn from this following Discourse.

In that Community which is betwixt God and Man, thorough a Relation which a reasonable Creature cannot but have to a good Creator, from whence ariseth his indispensable necessity to Worship and Obey him: It is requisite that all should know him, and what is his Will, according to the degree of means conducing thereto, which is graciously afforded them. This is the great dictate of Nature, and prescript of the Law. This Duty is no less imprinted in the Heart of Man, than in the Decalogue. Amongst the means which God makes use of for the discovery of himself, the Holy Scripture is not only the most excellent of all others, but as to saving Truths, it is the sole and only manifester thereof. —— As the Knowledge of

Marc. 12.
30, 31.

' God attended with the Spiritual Subjection
' of the Soul unto him intirely, is the prin-
' cipal Commandment in the First Table; so
' in the Second, the main thing enjoyned,
Sis the *Love of our Neighbour*. Now to Love

*Arist. rhe-
tor. 1.2.c.2.*

' another, is to wish and will unto him, all those
' things which we think good for him, and as
' far as it doth lye in our Power, to procure him
them. And the more perfect discoveries
of things that a Lover hath, the more
perfect and excellent is that Good which
he wishes, and cannot but wish unto him
whom he Loves. Now since this Love
must be of a very Transcendent Degree,
and proportioned to that wherewith we
Love our Selves; it cannot be such, unless
we do desire to Communicate and Impart
unto our Beloved, as far as in us lies,
that which is the Principal of all Goods:
And since the Knowledge of God as Life Eter-
nal, and consequently the chiefest good
which one can wish unto another, it
follows from the dictates of this com-
manding, and commanded Love, that it
is not Arbitrary for any to will or refuse
to instruct another in this saving know-
ledge, if he be able so to do, but all are
indispesably obliged to this performance,
as their Duty.

Ibid. §.15.

' Where God doth graciously dispense of
his Word according to his good Pleasure,
he doth therewith, thorough Jesus Christ,
distribute of his Spirit and Gifts plenti-
fully and variously, whereby the Saints
are

are enabled and fitted to instruct others in the Knowledge of God, 1 Cor. 12. Nor doth he make this distribution only to such as are solemnly called to the Work of the Ministry in some particular Church by (what do you call it?) Ordination: It is necessary that a Man be so gifted, before he receive Imposition of Hands; and some are so gifted, and yet never take upon them the Work of the Ministry. But all these things worketh that one and the self same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will, 1 Cor. 12. 11. Eph. 4. 7.

If now there be any Believer endued §. 16. with the Knowledge of God, and qualified with such Spiritual Graces as are requisite for the Teaching of others; and he have a mind to serve God in the Work of the Gospel; and also Time, Place, and all other Circumstances necessary for the upholding of Order and Decency do concur, **We do pronounce** it to be lawful for such a one to Preach the Gospel, to Exound the Scripture, to make Sermons to the People, although he be not entered into (such as Men call) *Holy Orders*.

And indeed why should not he do so? Shall §. 17. he be reputed destitute of a true Call; or to be ambitious, or usurp upon what is the Duty and Work of another; or to introduce a new and unusual Custom into the Church of God; or to be Troublesome and Factious, or to exceed his just Boundaries any way? So some Men say indeed; who, if they have laid

' aside all SHAME, should at least resume
 ' it in an Age so quick-sighted as ours is.
 Men that are of any Learning and Piety
 will, I know, consider well before they
 embrace such an Opinion, what Call is
 requisite for a Man to perform a Moral
 Duty, whence it hath its Rise, and what
 more it doth comprehend besides Spiritual
 Endowments, and a suitable ordering of Affairs
 by Providence. It hath not yet been proved,
 nor ever will be, that a Holy Purpose, and
 frame of Spirit [to reduce Men unto the
 Truth, and sincere Gospel of Jesus Christ]
 together with Qualifications competent
 for the Edification of others, besides the
 Commands of Christ for employing there-
 of, (if Providence make way for such ex-
 ercise of them) doth not compleat a Call.
 And if it do, all is well; for we pre-sup-
 posed those Conditions.

§. 18.

Nor doth he violate by such his *Actings*,
 any solemn Office of any peculiar Function.
 It is certain, that the Care to discharge
 some Moral Duties, is in an especial manner
 enjoyned to them who are the establish'd
 Ministers of the Churches; but that all
 others are, through such Delegation, prohi-
 bited the Performance thereof, this is false.
 There was never instituted such a peculiar
 Office for some Men, as that the residue
 of Mankind should be freed from that
 Charge which the Law of Nature, and
 the Injunctions of Christ, had laid them un-
 der: Nor would God place such an heavy,
 nay,

Qui si podo-
 vis egant,
 falso in
 hac loco
 Evangelii
 mutuo su-
 merent.

nay, insupportable Yoke upon the Ministers, thereby to exempt others from his Commands: Nor are we responsible for the Faults or Obedience of others; *The Just shall live by his Faith.*

As for the Confusion which this will §. 19.

introduce, it is not for them to object it, who make use of New and Paradoxial Inventions, *viz.* of ordaining Presbyters absolutely, that is, without respect to any Flocks or Churches to be under their Charges respectively, (as being the appointed Overseers thereof by the Holy Ghost) which kind of Ordination is not only prohibited that it should not be practised, but in case it be practised, it is declared to be null and invalid; and yet inveigh against (*) such as undertake the cure of a number of Men, to whom they will not administer the Sacrament.

If I were to produce Examples for the warranting of our [charitative] Preacher, it would not be difficult for me to deduce that, thorough all Ages unto our Times, to evidence that it is no Novel Usage in the Church.

This is a Reproof of the Presbyterians, (whom he in the precedent Paragraph charges, with *lack of Shame*) and such Ordination was condemned by *Luther, de ministr. Eccl. Inter op. T. 2. f. 365. c. 2. Non Men are ordained at Uncertainties, as many as are ordained, so as scarce any knows whose Priest he shall be.*

(*) It may be I mis-render him here, the place is obscure; but such practise is not warrantable in the Independents, to take Parsonages *cum cura*, and hold them *sine cura*, to take Tithes (which they think Evangelically unlawful) and yet not do what is legally to be expected by the Laws they hold them.

Finally,

§. 20.

' Finally, If it be *unlawful* for a Man, not
 entered upon Holy Orders, to expound the
 Scripture, or preach the Word of God, in
 the Circumstances pleaded for, then it is
 either intrinsically unlawful, and in it self,
 or by reason of some *Adjuncts* and *Circum-
 stances*; or else it is, perhaps, somewhere
 expressly prohibited in the Scripture: It
 cannot be unlawful in its own Nature, un-
 less it be absolutely unlawful for any Man,
 who is not a Minister of the Word, to in-
 struct another in the Knowledge of God.
 But I think there is not any who profess
 Christianity, who are yet so mad as to say
 so: Cain indeed, who was born of that evil
 one, and slew his Brother, did deny before
 God, that he was his Brother's keeper: But
 that was a Saying fit for him (and his
 Followers) who, next to Satan, was the
 first *Man-slayer*. How far God hath made
 every Man his Brother's Keeper, as to what
 respects his eternal Condition, I have al-
 ready shewed; and they who believe that
Faith in Christ was comprised in the Law
 given to our first Parents, will not deny
 the Preaching of the Gospel to be a *Moral
 Duty*. The Circumstances whereby we
 are to examine the Case controverted, are,
 either that he doth instruct a member, or that
 he doth it out of course: But these are such,
 as if the Work be good in it self, may pass
 for Commendations and high Endearments
 of the Man, rather than to inabilitate
 him: For there can be no Reason given,
 why,

why, if I may instruct One or Two in the
 Knowledge and Fear of God, I may not
 in like manner, instruct many more; and that
 out of Course, or ordinarily. They who affirm,
 That it is not lawful for any Believer,
 though never so gifted, and fit to teach,
 for to do thus, unless he be separated
 from amongst the rest, by a solemn Ordina-
 tion in some Church; it is incumbent on them
 to prove that there is such a Prohibition,
 which hitherto, I think, none of them
 have done.

I have cited this Passage of Dr. Owen's,
 the rather, because it gives me occasion to
 speak somewhat of those who are com-
 monly called *Quakers*: I am sorry he hath
 in so bitter a manner reviled an *Innocent sort*
 of *Men*, who might have merited better
 Usage, if not upon the account of their re-
 semblance to the *Primitive Aæetics*, who
 alone upheld Christianity of old; yet for their
 adhering to a Cause, wherein the Doctor is
 engaged, and which if it fall, he must be
 involved in the Ruine thereof. It were not
 difficult to re-charge him with Fanaticalness,
 since the Expressions of his, *Exercit. 3. S. 15.*
 That God delegated to him the Employ-
 ment of Writing against them; and that it
 is *mandatum munus*; a Work enjoyned him
 by the Lord. These being not to be ex-
 cused by Providential Circumstances, would
 justify the Imputation. But since I believe
 that he is in great part undeceived in his
 sinister Opinions concerning them, so I shall
 not

not contribute any thing towards the widening of a Breach, which is not at that distance as is vulgarly imagined.

If these Men have one common Analysis of their Faith, with what Dr. Owen professeth, (besides their symbolizing with him in other Opinions) I hope then, either both, or neither, will be found to be *Fanatical*, and the difference between them will only prove *gradual*, not *specifical*, in their *Enlightments*.

If they count the General Ministry of the Nation Babylonish and Anti-Christian, as bottomed on a Successive Ordination from the Papacy, Dr. Owen doth so too, and proves it.

If they say, their Churches are not Churches of Christ's Institution and Way, (I speak not of the Walls, whose relative Holiness is denied by both Presbyterian and Independent) Dr. Owen doth so too, and proves it.

If they think there is no Catholick Church, nor no National Church, but what is the Product of Humane, rather than Scriptural Decisions, and that they are not concerned in a Separation from the one or other, as to matter of Conscience: All this, I think, is allowed, and proved by Dr. Owen.

Do they think Tythes Anti-Christian? They who knew Dr. Owen in the Army, knew he profess'd it was his Doctrine then; and if he be an Independent, it must be so still.

Do they condemn University-Habits, and the Ministry-distinguishing Black? The former is condemned by Dr. Owen, and so (if all were known) the latter.

Do

Do they Contemn Ordination? Do they vilifie Humane Learning, Philosophy, and those other Qualifications which render a Man rather a worldly *Virtuoso*, than *Heavenly Preacher*? They who have heard Dr. Owen Preach at Oxon, and they who are acquainted with his Practise, imagine their dissent herein not to be very great.

Do they think Preaching not to be a distinct Calling, but a Moral Duty, which all upon occasion are obliged to, and do they practise accordingly? You see Dr. Owen defends them.

In fine, Whatever they say (that I can now remember) concerning the Scripture and the Light within them, hath it not a greater Affinity with Dr. Owen's Opinion, than Light bath with Darkness? Doth not he tell them, in the words alledged by me in the beginning out of him §. 7. That the Only, Publick, Autbentick and Infallible Interpreter of the Scripture, is the Spirit that gave it? Doth not he say, That another visible Arbitrator of Controversies arising from Scripture, is Useless, as well as Unwarranted by the Word of Christ? Doth he not say, That it is from the Afflatus, or Inspiration of the Spirit, that the Scripture bath its Authority, Verity and Perspicuity? Doth he not say, That the Spirit, by internal Enlightnings, doth lead us into all necessary Knowledge? Doth he not say, That the Just shall live by his Faith; and that he is not to acquiesce in the Sentiments of another, but in order to the Edification of his own Soul, to enquire

enquire into the Mind of God himself, by the help of an infused Light, without which the Scriptures have neither Authority, Verity, or Perspicuity? Yes, all this he doth say; only he adds, That the Holy Ghost is the Expositor of the Scripture, as speaking therein. Truly this Appendix I had not much reason to take notice of, it being to me unintelligible, as understood of the whole Scripture: The Holy Ghost speaking in the Scripture, is no more than the Scripture spoken by the Holy Ghost; which, being complexively taken, cannot be both Text and Exposition; no more than Littleton is Cooke upon Littleton. One might have said it was clear, perspicuous, and needed no Comment; but not that it was a Comment to it self. It would be a surprising Title in a Book seller's Shop, if instead of the ordinary Bible, he should inscribe it, **The Holy Ghost's Exposition upon the Bible.**

Waving then this irrational Appendix; Are the Quakers Fanatical, if they regard not the Expositions of fallible Men, private, contradictions, and no way Authentick; since besides the internal Expositor, an external, visible, infallible, authentick, publick Expositor is as far from being needful, as he is from being constituted by Christ, in the Judgment of the Reformed Divines and Dr. Owen. Dr. Owen would do well to write a Tract, to shew the Needfulness of Deceitful Expositors, and the needlessness of unerring Expositors, for to help out the Holy Ghost: In the mean

mean while it will not be a very culpable Tenderness in the *Quakers*, if they will not *bew out broken Cisterns*, which Dr. Owen assures them *will hold no Water*.

Are they Fanatical, if they *bid Men live up to the Light within them, which will lead them into all Knowledge*; since Dr. Owen assures them, that without the *Afflatus, or Inspiration of the Holy Ghost* (which is all one with the Light Internal) the Scripture hath no Authority, Truth or Perspicuity; that to understand or apprehend these qualities in the *Bible*, they must have the Light infused into their own Souls particularly; and without this there can be to them neither *Scripture or Salvation*? The difference is only whether the *Quakers* do not mistake Nature for Grace, and esteem of that to be a *Light of Christ* which is a *Light of Nature*: I profess I think they do not; and they have numerous Defendants, and Learned, which avow the *Universal Light resulting from the Death of Christ, dwelling in every Man, which will, if attended to, bring him to Salvation*; and that this is not Nature but Grace.

Indeed it is a plausible Argument that is drawn from Rom. 1. 19, 20. If the *Gentiles and Universality of Men* have so much Light Internal, as that the neglect, or male-using thereof, renders them in-

If this do not evince it; it is but introducing a new Hypothesis or Method in Divinity, as *Amiraldus*, and after him Mr. *Baxter* have done, and it may be demonstrated. But concerning this I may hereafter speak, in a Discourse how Christ is the *First-born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 15.

excusable;

excusable ; then if they do use it well, they may be not excusable : If not inexcusable, then excusable ; if excusable, then excused ; if excused, then saved : But there is no Salvation but by Christ, he is Life, and he is Light, therefore all this is ascribed rightly by them, unto that In-dwelling Light which is the *Author and Finisher of Faith.*

The Controversie then betwixt Dr. Owen and the *Quakers* doth not lye in this, that the *Quakers* do Preach ; for it is a Duty incumbent upon them to bring others into the Light wherein they do walk ; It is a Moral Duty : But he thinks that they mistake Light for Darkness. This then ought to be refuted, not they censured for their good will ; whose Charity might deserve our Thanks, rather than Scorn and Reproach (if we would learn from the *Heathen Antonines*) if their Errors did not Merit our assent.

Nor is the Controversie whether Gifted Men may Preach, but who are Gifted ? And here if the *Arrians* condition was alleviated by *Salyian*, because they did account of the Orthodox for Hereticks, as the Orthodox did also repute them for such ; Why may not the *Quakers* be favoured so, if they think others to be as Fanatical, as they are themselves supposed to be ? The same may be said in the behalf of them, as to the Circumstances in which they speak ; they esteem of Decency and Order one way, Dr. Owen perhaps another.

Seeing

*Seeing I have gone thus far in an Apology
for the poor despised Quakers, I shall
proceed to remove some Vulgar Objections
that are made against them.*

Some there are that demand of them Miracles, as a Testimony of the Spirit wherewith they are acted. To these I answer, with Anton. Sadeel, That it is an *Evil and an Adulterous Generation that seeketh after a Sign*, Matth. 12. 39. and ch. 16. 4. and Paul tells us, *The Jew's require a Sign*, 1 Cor. 1.22. And if when Miracles were frequent in the Church, even then they were condemned who did seek after, and adhere unto them; How intolerably insolent are they who require them now, that they are ceased? Besides, What Miracles did Obadiab, Nabum, and several others of the ancient Prophets, who declared heretofore the Truth, yet were they extraordinarily called? And to use Chrysostome his words, *What Miracle did John the Baptist, who instructed so many People and Towns?* For the Evangelist saith positively, He did no Miracles, John 10. 41. Yet who will thereupon say that John had not the Spirit, or was not extraordinarily excited to Preach Repentance to the People? Moreover, when the Lord bids his People not to believe the Miracles of the false Prophets, Deut. 13., he doth sufficiently instruct us what use we ought to make of Miracles:

*De vocat
ministr.*

*In Matth.
hom. 47.*

¶ In a word, since many true Prophets have done no Miracles, and sundry false Prophets have done some; it is a Sign that Miracles cannot satisfie a Rational Curiosity about a Call or spiritual Endowments: It istrue, that of Antichrist, *His coming is after the working of Satan, with all Power, and Signs, and lying Wonders,* 2 Thess. 2. 9. But God shall (saith the Apolle) confound him with the Spirit of his Mouth, and the Brightness of his Coming, Ibid. v. 1. Much more might be replied for them in this point, out of Morney du Plessis, Donnerus, and others, who have satisfyed the Papists, who demanded Miracles from them who first attempted to reform the Church.

In their Writings you may find Answers to all such Objections as are general against a party designing a Reformation.

I have known some offended at the mis-carriages of some Quakers, and thereupon declaimed against the whole Sect: These Men would certainly have condemned the Apostles for one Judas; and extirpate the Good Corn, by reason of a mixture of Tares. If such a procedure may be allowed, the most condemning Party in England would be the greatest Sufferers by it.

Some object, That if they have the Spirit in such a measure, they may Expound all difficult places in Scripture, and reconcile Contradictions: And I have known some to take this course whereby to expose them. But I must tell such Men, this was not a thing

thing to be performed by the first Reformers, nor nor yet by Apostles and Primitive Christians; who, that they were endowed with the Holy Ghost, it is unquestionable: So Peter saith that in Paul's Epistles, *There are some things hard to be understood,* 2 Pet. 3. 16. Whether he spake this as that they were so to him, or to other Christians in those days, it is evident that there may be some things in Scripture difficult to those that have the Spirit. And this will further appear from Paul's own deportment: 1 Cor. 6. His Judgment had been asked concerning several things, v. 1. Yet hereto he answers sometimes as from God, v. 10. *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord;* sometimes from himself, v. 12. *But to the rest speak I, not the Lord.* So v. 15, 16. Now concerning Virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained Mercy of the Lord to be Faithful. I suppose therefore. — This inequality in the Apostle's answer, doth sufficiently shew that we are not to be too peremptory, in demanding a satisfaction to all Doubts, even from Men of the highest Illuminations: *We know in part, and we prophesie in part,* 1 Cor. 13. 9. Shall an Apostle say this, and is it intollerable in a Quaker?

But they are illiterate Persons, unacquainted with Tongues and Languages. It is true, and I profess I never knew that the Gift of Tongues was Universal, or ought to be so. Not to recriminate upon the first

Ages, not to tell you that in the *Nicene Council* (whose Creed is so famous) there was not one that understood *Hebrew*; not to bespatter the present Ministry, doth nor the

Where was Learning amongst the Waldenses and Picards?

Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 26. distinguish betwixt *a Doctrine, a Tongue, a Revelation, an Interpretation*, as things that might be found in several Persons, and yet they have the Spirit? If this Exception be of any validity, then is that whole Chapter overthrown, and Men must covet no less to speak with *Tongues*, than to *Prophecie*. But further, Did not Christ choose Illiterate Men for Disciples? Is not the Gospel of *John* as bad *Greek* as any *Quaker's English*? I say nothing of the difference betwixt *Isaiah* and *Jeremiab*, &c. Hath not God chosen the Foolishnes of the World, to confound the Wisdom thereof?

Cunct de rep. Heb. 1. 3. c. 7.

1 Cor. 1. 27. And whereas it is usually said, That he called the Ignorant, but he did not leave them so, but Gifted them. I desire to know how this can be reconciled to what

Methinks I hear the managers of this objection to speak as the Heathen So-pluster, *Libanius*, did against the Christians; yea, and their Ministers under *Theodosius*, εὐτάτῳ μηδ τις ἡρήτας εἴη πυρετός ή σφύρας ή αἷμανας δένεντον, περὶ δὲ τὰς ὑπαίθριας καὶ ἀσπάραδρος ἐχόντων εἰς εὐταῦν διαγένεται. Let us [not] hear what these Men say concerning Heaven, God and Goodness, who come forth Black and Sooty, from the *Smiths Forge and Anvil*. *Liban. orat. pro Templis. p. 13. edit. Gothotredi.*

the Apostle faith (and what all Records ascertain us of), that amongst the first Christians, there were not many wise Men after the Flesh? 1 Cor. 1. 26. Where is the Wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this World? 1 Cor. 1. 20. If what these Respondents say be true, it had been easie

to tell *Paul*, that amongst the Christians there were not any or many wise and suitable *Disputants* through acquired Parts, but there were by Grace.

But they mis-cite *Scripture*: Who is the Judge thereof? Who art thou, O Man, that judgest? They stand, or fall, to themselves. It is not by Logical Deductions that we are to try *Apostolick Spirits*, either as to *Assertions* or *Citations*. He that will experiment this, let him consider well, *Matt. 1. 15, 17, 23; Rom. 9. 13; Matt. 27. 9; Gal. 3. 16; Heb. 6. 16*, though indeed the whole Epistle to the *Hebrews* is full of such Arguings as are very obscure to the most acute Disputant, and such oftentimes as nothing can verifie, but that they proceed from an *infallible Spirit*, which renders the Consequence materially and not formally good. And so what will justifie those Discourses, will avail a *Quaker*, if he be sure that what he says is of God, who when he speaks, makes all *Assertions* true, *Consequences* warrantable, and *Citations* past doubt.

As for what is usually objected against a Sufferance of Quakers, that they so oppose Magistracy and Ministry, as that no Civil Government in Prudence can tolerate them. Since hereby what there is of Speculation in their Religious Opinions is waved, and rendred as tolerable as *Aminians*, *Supralapsarians*, &c. I shall speak briefly to their Practise, and *Practical Opinions*. It is undeniably that they do the Magistrate very good

Service in reclaiming such; as neither Minister nor Magistrate perhaps ever speak to, from their wicked Ways unto more wholesome Morals: And of this there is very good Experience in the Northern Counties.

Justo lex non est posta: yet is not he therefore insufferable in a Republick. They do not transgres, only upon another Principle perform the same things. They are so against the Magistrate, that (like to what the Apostle would have, 1 Cor.6) they never go to Law. But some will say, they violate the Laws by not paying *Tithes*. But this is false, for he who submits to the Punishment, doth as really fulfil the Law, as the most Pharisaical Tithe-Payer. But they will not put off their Hats; they say *Thou* and *Thee* to the Magistrate. Truly this is a small Argument of a Repugnancy to Magistrates. In *Rome* they wore neither Hats nor Caps; neither Magistrates nor others usually; yet did not this overthrow their Magistracy. In *Rome* they did always (as also in *Greece*) *Thou* their Magistrate, yet was it not Sedition. *Erasmus* hath a Discourse against *you* or *vos*, in the behalf of *Thou* or *Tu*; which Address, if our Magistrate resent, we always bestow it upon God in Prayer. *Luther*, in his *Ludus*, sports himself with it, laughing at that *Magister vos estis iratus*, or, Master you are angry. In *Spain* it is Contumelious to say *You*. And what

This is allowed by
Lipsius man-
g're all Op-
position.
*Adv. vosisfa-
tore.*

what we now contend about, is no more than a *French Fashion* in Speech, and hath no more of Disobedience in it, than Plainness of Cloaths hath against the Gaudy Apparel of Rulers, and Soft Raiment in Princes Courts. But if all I have said were nothing yet since what they do is out of Conscience I see not why they, who should never eat a *Rump of Beef*, whilst the World stands, rather than offend their Brother, should so ^{1 Cor. 8. 13.} insist upon Words. I think the whole Discourse in *Rom. 14.* will excuse them, more than their Adversaries. They neither refuse to obey, or discharge Magistracy; they deny that any such thing is consequential to their *Tenets*: Why then is it not as good Logick in their behalf, *Sublato consequente tollitur antecedens*; as for their Condemnation, *Posito antecedente ponitur consequens*?

I know divers Reports are given out, concerning several enormous Acts and Miscarriages of some *Quakers*; but I am so well acquainted with the Stratagems of Satan in this kind, how Christ himself, and afterwards the first Christians, were aspersed, (as you may see in *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, *Minutius Felix*, &c.) and what hath been of our *Reformers*, that I shall not entertain an ill Opinion of them thereupon, no not though I see Processes printed, and the Ministers (of Lies) attest it. It were easie to recriminate; but their Endeavours must be, not to suffer as *Evil-doers*, but to be otherwise spoken of, they must not expect.

The *Presbyterians* are so well known to be Enemies to all Magistracy, that their Government is inconsistent with it, and all the *Popish* and *Lutheran* World cry out of them. The *Quakers* take no Oaths, the other never keeps them, as they are upbraided, and the *Judicium Oxoniense* tells them. I pass by ancient and modern Practises in *Scotland*, the late Rebellion in *Lancashire* sufficiently shews them. Had the *Quakers* made any such Attempt, How had they been decried? How barbarous would it have been, for them to act for their Truths, what the others designed? The Parliament may learn in part, from Matt. 21. 28, 29, 30, 31. the difference betwixt the *Presbyterians* (that so flattered R. C.) and the *Quakers*, in the two Sons. The one, like the *Presbyterian*, tells the *Magistrate*, *I go SIR, but goes not*: These are undoubtedly Enemies to Magistracy. The other omits the deference of *SIR*, the *Congee*, and the *wagging of the Cap*, but goes. Certainly, if that Son, who told his Father, *He would not go, yet repented, and went*, is by our *Saviour* allowed to have fulfilled his Father's Commands: They who will follow *Christ*, must remit of their Harshness to the *Quaker*, who says not so, but goes.

Yea, but they debase the Magistracy they execute, because they omit the Splendour of it. The Common-wealth of *Rome* will attest the contrary, which was best governed, when her Magistrates had not that Pomp and Splendour which is now cried up. A
good

good Life, Gravity; and Stayedness, are more prevalent for the keeping of the most Barbarous in Subjection (as is evident among the Tartars also) than a Scarlet Cloak. Well, but they oppose the Ministry in the Publick Assemblies, I answer, All Opposition doth no more overthrow Order, than it doth Truth. That which we call Order now, the Apostle did not heretofore. And if the Publick Assemblies will be Churches of Christ, and condemn them for breach of the Command, of doing all things according to Order, they must know, that it is they, and not the Quakers, ^{1 Cor. 1.} that violate the Apostles Order, which is, That several may speak, and if ^{30, 31.} ought be revealed to another, the Speaker must be silent; or else it is he that is Disorderly, and his Abettors. As for my part, since I am not sensible of the Convictions or Emotions of the Spirit under which another lies, so I dare not condemn the Quaker, whether he reprove openly, or walk naked through the Streets, denouncing Woes and Menaces: It is a sufficient Argument for me, that what God bids, is not undecent; nor do they any thing for which they have not a like Example, and (possibly) resembling Commands. However, Did not the Protestant Martyrs so disturb the Popish Priests, as the present Ministers are disturbed? And that when there were Laws against them? And did this Disobedience or Indecency hinder them from being catalogued as Martyrs? Read over the Acts and Monuments; consult

consult your Laws ; If what they did were Justifiable, not the thing it self, but Circumstances are to be disputed.

what must we think of the Stools and Criekets devoutly thrown at the Minister's or Bishop's Head, as he did officiate in his Surplice in Scotland, the Picture of which Fact was sold for Religion in the beginning of our Wars ?

such, as suffered upon the account of having committed such Disturbances, from being reputed Martyrs ; we may not only learn thence, what Esteem such Sufferers were in before, but even that since that Council they may be reputed Saints. But they will not take an Oath. I see not how this doth prejudice Magistracy and Government, if they will yet keep their Word. I know not how Christ's Commands do interfere with Civil Polity. It is true, some think the Prohibition of Swearing not to be a Precept, but an Evangelical Council : That the fulfilling thereof, argues an high and extraordinary Perfection ; but the Violation of it is not sinful. Thus Bernard in his 65 Sermon upon the Canticles, and Christianus Druthmarus, who lived above seven hundred Years ago, if we credit Trithemius. You see what Esteem those Men would have for a Quaker upon this account, he who now should be exterminated Humane Society, as an Enemy to Government ; had by them been celebrated for a Christian of more than ordinary Accomplishments. But I shall not detain my Reader any longer ; when I shall see more objected

objected against them than is here, and in these Queries defended, I may say more: Though if *Balzac*, or *Rutgerius*, had written his *Character* of the ancient Christian, the *Quaker* would not now have stood in need of an *Apology*.

X. Whether the Papists say they sent them, or deny it? And whether Commissions and Delegations are to be interpreted according to the Intention of the Granter, or Fancy of the Grantee? Whether in Rules of Common Policy, being by ^a Justice, to keep the Peace under an Usurper, may, by virtue of such a Commission, draw a Sword against him? Is not it understood by Peace, that particular Governour's Peace? And is it not so in Matters of Truth?

I never heard of any Oath that was given, so as to be expounded in the sense of the Receiver, except the Covenant. *Vid. judic. Oxon, lat. p. 54. Abcam of Oaths, p. 57.*

XI. Whether the very Principles of Protestantism, which makes the Scripture the Sole Rule of Faith, and leaves no Authoritative Publick Interpreter thereof, doth not invalidate all Extrinsical Authority? And whether the first Reformers have not taught us to reject the Authority of Universities, Authors, Councils, (a) and that for no addere to Texts of Scripture; for the meaning whereof (if Adversaries may pass for Competent Judges) they had nothing but their own Fancies to alledge, or False Glosses? And if available (building on such authority) they

(a) They

(o) They accuse *Luther*, not that he
 'dissents from the Scripture [as neither do
 'our Sectarians, as they call them, in the Letter]
 'but because he dissents from Universities,
 'Holy Fathers, and Councils.— But what is
 'more manifest, than that neither Univer-
 'sities, nor *Holy Fathers*, nor *Councils*, can
 'make Articles of Faith; because not only
 'Universities, but *Holy Fathers* and *Councils*
 'may err?— *Melancthon. Apol. pro Luther.*
Inter op. Lutheri. edit. Witeberg, T. 2. f. 193.

c. r. 2. Reader, Thou art to know, that
 the Controversie betwixt us and the *Papists*
 (except some Fools, and such as their own
 side now explode) is not, Whether an *Uni-*
versity, the *Holy Fathers*, or a *General Council*,
 can make new Articles of Faith; but whe-
 ther upon any emergent *Faith-Controversie*,
 what they declare to be the *Mind of God*,
 is to be received as such, and acquiesced
 therein, by *Christians*, so as not to dispute it
 thence-forward any more, upon their *Au-*
thority, buttressed up with some *Texts of*
Scripture, which make no more for the *Coun-*
cil of Trent, than the *Synod at Westminster*;
 nor any more for the latter, than for an
Assembly of Anabaptists: If they would but
 have the confident Presumption to apply
 them. It is then evident, that what *Man*,
 or Party of *Men* whosoever, shall take upon
 him or them to *Declare* unto others *Autbo-*
ratively, so as to oblige (or tell them that
 they are obliged) to believe it hence-for-
 ward (we being, by our First-Protestant-
 Arguments,

Arguments, absolved from all precedent *Declarations*) as a *Matter of Faith*, and the disbelieving whereof is *Damnable Heresie*, it is an assuming of that *Power*, which (if to have it there needs no more than to pretend to it) the *Papists* had at first, and at this day claim. But for the *Esteem* that is to be payed to *Universities*, and *University-men*, when they err (or are apprehended so to do) you may learn further from *Melancthon* in the same place, Fol. 195. c. 1, 2. ‘As for *Universities*, we need not trouble our selves at them, the very *School-Divinity* which they uphold, shews that all such Schools are *Heretical*. Let our *Masters* [this is used by way of contumely; as the Jews called their Doctors *Rabbi*, so in the *Universities* they used to say, *Magister noster*, Our Master; and in *Scotland* all their *Ministers*, and they only, that I know, are called *Mas John*, &c. that is, *Master*] let them cry out he hath spoken Blasphemy, he accuseth the Schools of *Heresie*. ‘Very well, if they teach those things which are dissonant from the *Gospel*, as the *School-Divinity* of *Paris*, [may not one upon the like Convictions speak as irreverently of *Oxon* or *Cambridge*?] is repugnant thereunto, which alone is received and prevails almost in *Europe*, and at the *Sorbonne*. Wherefore, Reader, thou needest not wonder if *Luther* be against *Universities*, they being the Dwellings of Lies, as *Micab* urged it. But, you will say, Who can think so many Men can err? All Men err, who

Omnis Scho-
la esse Her-
reticas, vel
Theologia
Scholaistica
coarctatis.

Academia
domus mem-
dacii sunt.

who teach things contrary to the Gospel,
 all that allow of that wicked School-Divinity.
 How! So many? Yes. For in the midst
 of Samaria, amongst such numbers of
 Baal's Priests, How few Elijah's were there?
 Call to mind the whole History of Judah
 and Samaria, which were a Type of the
 Church of Christ, How few Prophets will
 you find, and how many Idolaters? And in
 the declining of that Kingdom, how
 many Pharisees and Sadducees, that is, Priests,
 and Monks, and School-Men? Do not you
 know what the Prophet Ezekiel saith, *As*
is the Mother, so is the Daughter? We have
 imitated, yea, we have out-done the Mon-
 strosities of that Synagogue, we have
 justified her, as I may Phrase it, with the
 Prophet.

XII. Whether to make up a Divine of the best
 Rank (for the generality of them are not so qual-
 ified) more be necessary than Skill in Tongues,
 Knowledge of Antiquity, and School-Divi-
 nity? Whether any of the first Centuries after
 the Apostles did understand Hebrew? How
 many of the Latin Fathers before Jerom did un-
 derstand Greek? In particular, Whether Au-
 stin did much understand either? Whether there
 can be any Knowledge of Antiquity? (a) And
 whether School-Divinity be not a Novel Thing,
 slighted and condemned by Learned and Godly
 Men in all Ages, since it was first intro-
 duced? (b)

(a) Eusebius,

(a) *Eusebius*, in his Preface to his Ecclesiastical History, doth acknowledge, that as to the Records of precedent Times, he had little certain help, besides the *Acts of the Apostles*: But this Question is handled at large in a Learned Treatise of Mr. Daille's, about the Use of the Fathers.

(b) Amongst the Articles condemned by the *Sorbonists* as *Luther's*, there are these following, with the ensuing Censures.

1. *Scholaſtical Divinity* [in which it is that our *Doctors* Commence, for the *Apostolical Doctors* or *Teachers* were no *Graduates*, nor was there any *School-Divinity* then] is a mis-understanding of the Holy Scripture and Sacra-
ments, and bath veiled from us the sincere and true Divinity.

This Proposition is False, Rashly and Proudly asserted, and repugnant to sound Doctrine.

2. When the School or Mock-Divinity began, then was the Divinity of the Cross of Christ rendered of no Effect, and all things became perverted.

This is a False, Presumptuous, and Irrational Assertion, and resembles the Error of the *Bohemians*, (those are the Prede-
cessors of the Protestants in *Bohemia*, of which number was *John Huss*, and *Jerom of Prague*, generally acknowledged for Mar-
tyrs) which hath been condemned.

3. It is now almost Three hundred Years, since the School-Divines have corrupted the Scriptures, to the incomparable Detriment of the Church.

Mark the Antiquity of school-Divi-
nity: This was censured
This in 1581.

This is a false, foolish and malicious Assertion. *Vide opera Lutheri. t. 2, fol. 191. c. 2.*

Edit. Witteberg. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York.

In opposition to this Censure of the *Parisian Divines*, did *Melancthon* write; and amongst a multitude of Reflections upon *School-Divinity*: ‘When I think more upon the busyness, it is my judgment that *Paris* doth not now begin to transgress; then were they besotted, when the *Word of God* was first defiled with *Humane Disputes*, and mixed with *Philosophy*. For it is certain that that profane *School-Learning*, which they call *Theology* or *Divinity*, had its Birth and Original at *Paris*; and if it be once admitted of, there is nothing safe, nothing sound in the Church of God: The Gospel is obscured, Faith extinguished, Free-Will and Good Works introduced, and instead of professing Christianity, we become not followers of the *Law*, but Adherents of *Aristotle*; and the *Christian Precepts*, contrary to the intent of the Spirit of God, turns to a Philosophical way of living; you would with Spiritual Eyes discern, what Mischief that *School-Divinity* of yours, bred up and continued amongst you, and from thence propagated into all the other *Schools* and *Universities* of Europe, what hurt it hath done to the Church. This may suffice to shew the judgment of those Glorious Reformers: It were needless to repeat all their Testimonies that have given out the like witness: Believe it, Reader,

Vid. opera
Lutheri t. 2.
fol. 192. c. 2.
edit. Witte-
berg.

if thou art of this judgment, thou hast
the most glorious Martyrs, the most re-
nowned Christians, and as learned Men as
any, to defend thee; I forbear to Catalogue
them, or recite their Testimonies, because
I think none will deny it: Nor must thy
Adversaries excuse themselves, that it is
only the impertinent part thereof that is
condemned by these Men, but all those
subtleties which perplex the Minds of sober
Christians: It was not the Ignorance of such
Curiosities (which are condemned by the
Papists) but of such *School-Divinity* as makes
up the Controversies betwixt the *Romanist*
and *Reformed Religion*, that was objected by
Rosweydis the Jesuite, to the learned *Isaac*
Casaubon; for whom his Son Dr. *Merick*
Casaubon (now living in *England*, and Fa-
mous for his Learning) makes this reply,
after his Defence of his Father against other
Criminations. ‘ There remains now to be
spoken of the *Dialectical* or *Scholastick Di-*
vinity: This, of what nature soever it be,
if it be not comprehended in the *Word of*
God, and if all the Ancients were ignorant
of it, let my Father have been ignorant
thereof, and let you his Adversaries past
therein; subtleties and vain janglings of
words [*λεπτολογίας* and *κυρωπίας*] which
through too much Curiosity, for the most
part degenerate into Profaneness and Im-
piety, or Folly and Ridiculousness; in
fine, all contests about words [*λογομαχίας*]
which were begot thorough Idleness, and

Vid. Hospl-
niam de orig.
temp. t. l. 3.

' Ignorance of better Learning (which was
 ' the infelicity of those days, in which they
 ' first arose) he did not more vehemently
 ' decline, than he did pursue more profitable
 ' and beneficial Studies. Meric. Casaubon,
pietas contra maledicos patrii nominis & religio-
nis hostes, p. 122.

XIII. *Whether the Knowledge of Tongues lead us to one Sense of Scripture, or many? Whether all such dealings lead us not to put our Trust in Man? Can any matter of Faith be built upon the strength of a Criticism?*

XIV. *Whether the first Christians used much and long Preaching amongst themselves? Or did build their Doctrine upon Criticisms?*

Any one, who is but indifferently versed in the New Testament, will see the difference betwixt the Preaching now in Vogue, and what the Apostles practised, when the Ministry was not a Trade, but a Christian Duty. A little discerning will inform one how the Conversion of Men is become Church-work: But further, in the Church at Corinth, *Two or Three might speak, and if ought were revealed to another, the Person speaking was to hold his Peace: (Yea, they might all prophesie one after another)* But what was Order then, is Disorder now; and if any one offer to speak in an Assembly, he that is speaking doth so far decline Silence, that

he

he complains, and impleads the other (tho' possibly filled with a more Seasonable, if not better *Word of Prophecy*; and which ought to be, as *Apples of Gold in Tables of Silver*) for Interruption. Then they came together, and every one had a Psalm [not of David's penning, 'but his own'] a *Doctrine, a Tongue, a Revelation, an Interpretation.* Now there is no such thing, nor would it be suffered, though the Apostle with regard thereunto particularly says, *Let all [these] things be unto Edifying:* This was no Confusion in a Church planted immediately by the Apostles, and supplied with Men, filled with the Holy Ghost, thorough their Imposition of Hands; yet it is not tolerated in *Parish-Churches*, of a *Popish Establishment*, and possessed by Men whom the Imposition of the Hands of the *Presbytery* fills with another Spirit. It is in reference hereunto, that the Apostle, bidding all *Covet to prophesie* (not prophesie out of Covetousness) faith, *If any Man think himself to be a Prophet, or Spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you, are the Commandments of God.* Whose Commandments are they then that repugnto this Usage? And what a Trial doth the Apostle suggest whereby to judge of *Scandalous, or Spiritual Christians* and *Prophets*. And here I shall take notice of the *Jewish Synagogues*; teaching there was no Levitical *Act*, nor yet to be performed by *Licensing and Ordination*. Christ came into the Synagogue at *Nazareth*, being neither *Levite*, nor *Luke 4. 16.*

ordained, on the Sabbath Day, and stood up to Read: They did not Clamour, but gave him the Book, and he Read, and Expounded; and they, instead of what would have happened in our Parish-Churches, Bare him witness, and wondred at the gracious Words which proceeded out of his Mouth; and they said, Is not this Joseph's Son? He was not Rabbi Jesus Ben Joseph. They wonder how he Preaches, they ask not why he Preaches: Yea, in the Synagogue at Antioch, when *Paul* and *Barnabas* came into the Synagogue on the Sabbath Day, and sat down, after the Reading of the Law and the Prophet, the Rulers of the Synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye Men and Brethren, if ye have any word of Exhortation for the People, say on. Either *Paul* and *Barnabas* were before known to the Jews, or not; if not, we see their Custom (for it is not observed to have been Extraordinary) to admit, yea, invite Strangers of untryed Doctrine, to Preach publickly, in the Synagogue, on the Sabbath Day, to the People. If they were known to them before, they could be known to them, being Jews, (and such as contradicted and blasphemed afterwards, v. 45.) no otherwise than Quakers are to the vulgar Orthodox; and so the example is more pregnant, viz. 'The Rulers of the Synagogue knowing that *Paul* and *Barnabas* did Teach a way which did subvert their present Religion and Jerusalem-Worship and Poverty, yet being Men of Humility, Meekness,

ness, and unblameable Life, they sent unto them, in the Synagogue, on the Sabbath Day, to Exhort the People.

As for Christ Teaching and Disputing in the Temple amongst the Doctors, he being but *Twelve Years Old*, it is a thing of greater influence upon our Divines; his Disputing, and his Sitting there, was an act no way allowed, but upon the consideration of Extraordinary Gifts. The Jewish way of making *Rabbi's* was, the Disciples did first sit at the Feet of their Master. After he had been a Disciple for a sufficient time, then was he created *Rabbi*, by *Imposition of Hands*, ^{χειροτόνη} and formally declared *Rabbi* or *Master*, yet ^{σία} yet was not he thereupon called *Rabbi* or *Master*: But the Friend or Familiar Ac- ^{Vid. Jo. Scaliger. Elench. tributes. c. 10.} quaintance of *Rabbi* E. Nor did he sit in the presence of his *Master*, but stood: So that for *Christ*, who was neither according to his Age, or usual Discipline, a *Rabbi*, for him to be admitted to Sit and Dispute amongst the *Doctors*, it shews a greater regard for gifted Men, than is now afforded. Here we may observe (probably) the right use of *Imposition of Hands*, not to make *Clergy-men*, but *Rabbi's* (but we know who said, *Be not you called Rabbi's, or Doctors*) Think you that only the *Hebrew* particular appellation is prohibited? No, the following words disprove that. The *Rabbi's* were not *Levites*, nor had *Tithes*, and if our *Mi-nisters* be their substitutes, neither ought they.

XV. Whether Scrutins be the indubitable Word of God, and whether that can be said by any Reformed Divines, since they have condemned all Additions, even such as is Explica-

* Vide Col. 3. 17. *Quodcumque igitur vobis dicitur, nescire debet, non debet vobis respondere.*
loqu. Ratio-
bonense. "If they be the undoubted Word of God,
there not four Gospels? Are there not the same
things reiterated in the Epistles? Is there not
Deuteronomy, as well as Exodus and Leviticus?
And Chronicles as well as Kings?

XVI. Whether they, who were Teachers of the People of God in the Primitive Times, were not Handy-crafts-men of several Trades? (a)

(a) So Paul was a Tent-maker, and followed that Occupation in the time of his Apostleship; and Celsus objected it to Origen (Origen, lib. 30. *adv. Celsum*) that the Christian Teachers, such as propagated the Gospel, were Ἐρυπῆις, ἐκστότοις, ἔκβασῖς,
ἐκτίσεστοι, ἀποικίτοις, Weavers, (or Com-
bers of Wool.) Coblers, Fullers, and Illiterate, and exceeding Rustick.

Wernerus faith, in like manner of the Waldenses, That before their time, the [Anti-christian] Church and Catholick Faith had been molested by Princes, subtle Philosophers, *ncuse Heretics*, and other Persons of Note: But in those days it was not a little disquieted by most vile Ideas, and poor Lay-men. Unto which Bishop Usher, by way of Apology, replies, 'That God (as the Apostle said, 1 Cor. 1. 27.) had chosen the foolish things

' Things of the World, that he might confound
 ' the Wise; and the Weak, whereby to invalidate
 ' the Strong: That, what Jacobus de Vitriaco
 ' had written about one Fulco a Presbyter
 ' of great Simplicity and Ignorance; might
 ' be accommodated to Peter Waldo, and his
 ' Followers. As God did choose Fishermen and
 ' Ideots (or plain Country People) that so Isa. 48. 11.
 ' be might not give his Glory to another; so, for Lament 4. 4.
 ' as much as the little ones had asked Bread; and
 ' the learned being busied about vain Disputations,
 ' and word-Contentions, did neglect to break it
 ' unto them, the Lord did in his Mercy, choose
 ' him, as a Star in a Cloud, as Rain in a dry
 ' Season, as another Sangar, who with the
 ' Plough-share of his rude Preaching should slay
 ' many. Yea, it was objected unto the Judg. 3. 31.
 ' aforesaid Christians of the Waldensians and
 ' Bobemians; Doctores ipsorum sunt Textores &
 ' Sutores. Their Teachers are Weavers and
 ' Coblers. Whereto they replyed, We are
 ' not ashamed of our Priests, because they la-
 ' bour with their Hands, procuring thereby a
 ' livelihood to themselves, according as they are
 ' able, because both the Doctrine and Exam-
 ' ple of the Apostles doth lead us to such Appre-
 ' bensions. Usher de
succes. c. 6.
S. 28.

XVII. Whether there were not as much cause
 for learned Disputes in those times, as now? Are
 there any New Opinions in our days, such as are
 maintained with more Rhetorick, or Subtlety,
 than those of Old? Surely no.

XVIII. Whether the first Christians were not against Humane Learning and Heathenish Authors? (*) And whether it was only an effect of Julian the Apostate's Malice, or Christian Prudence, that went about to keep the People of God from reading Heathen Writers? (**) L. 3. p. 137.

(*) *Herald. Animad. in Arnob.* 'The Christians [in the Primitive Times] living excluded from all Honours and Magistracies, did neglect those Studies, which are mainly necessary for the laudable discharge of Civil Trusts and Employments: Moreover, Because the Sopifiers and Philosophers were the principal Enemies of Christianity; therefore even upon this account were they disgusted at all Philosophy. They were no less severe in their Censures of all manner of Florid and Polite Learning: They condemned Tragedies and Comedies, and other Poetical Writings, being the main part of Humane Learning, as thinking they did not conduce to solid Knowledge, and being full of Wantonness and Obscenity, as also Promptuaries of Fabulous Idolatries. Hence it was, that Tertullian thinks School-Masters, and other Professors of Learning, to be guilty of a manifold Idolatry, whose busines it was, to explain the Names, Genealogies, Fabulous Acts and Elogies of the Heathen Gods. Generally the Believers in those days harboured a very bad Esteem for Secular Learning. Whence it is clear, that Secular Learning was endangered in those Times of the Ancient

*Lib. de Ido-
latr.*

p. 138.

p. 139.

‘ Ancient Christians, who were so much the
 ‘ more provoked thereunto, because the
 ‘ better Sort of the Gentiles did continually
 ‘ upbraid them, that they were a sort of
 ‘ *Idiots, and Illiterate Persons*: That their
 ‘ Teachers were Rude and Ignorant, Combers
 ‘ of Wooll, Coblers, Fullers. These things be-
 ‘ ing continually objected unto them, there-
 ‘ fore the Christians did on the other side
 ‘ reply, That the *Learning*, wherein their
 ‘ *Adversaries* did so pride themselves, was
 ‘ an useless thing, and no way advantagious
 ‘ to Salvation; nay, that it did estrange the
 ‘ wise Men of this World from the Ways
 ‘ of God, and was a great occasion of their
 ‘ Ruin. This Altercation made the Chris-
 ‘ tians to be contemned and vilified as
 ‘ weak and ignorant Men. Hence it was
 ‘ that *Celsus* upbraided them, that they re-
 ‘ jected all the wiser sort, and embraced
 ‘ only the Communion of *Fools and Slaves*.
 ‘ The Christians did declare, That Men of
 ‘ any Condition might be Saved, *Servants*,
 ‘ *Idiots*, and *Rusticks*, such as the World
 ‘ valued as *Fools*; that God did confound
 ‘ the *Wise* in their own *Wisdom*; that the
 ‘ *Wisdom* of the World was *Folly* before the
 ‘ Almighty; that he revealed his *Mysteries*
 ‘ to Babes, and hid them from the *Wise*:
 ‘ These and the like Passages the Proud
 ‘ *Worldlings* could not endure. Therefore
 ‘ *Celsus* (as *Origen* in the same Book tells us)
 ‘ said, That the Christians did proclaim it
 ‘ in their Assemblies; *Let none that is Wise
 enter*
origen, l. 3.

enter ; none that is Learned ; none that is Prudent ; for thus it is appointed us in the Gospel. But if there be any Unlearned, any Unwise, any Foolish, let him approach with Confidence. For whilst they [the Christians] acknowledged these to be fit Servants for their God, it is evident that they only desire, and can only effect the Conversion of Stupid and Senseless, of Slaves, Women, and little Children.

P. 25.

Ouzelius, in his Animadversions upon Minut. Felix, saith, ' That as the Gentiles did object unto the Christians their Rude Style, Harsh Language, and destitute of all Address, calling them Rusticks and Clowns ; so the Christians did again, by way of Irony and Mockage, term them the Polite, the Eloquent, and the Learned. This he proveth by ample Testimonies out of Labantius, Arnobius, Isidorus, Pelusiota, Theodore, and others.'

(2) Of this, Libanius is a pregnant Witness in his Life, Tom. 2. p. 51. Amongst other his Misfortunes, he laments the great Contempt, and Scorn that was cast upon the Greek Tongue after the Death of Julian, Καὶ μὴ καὶ τόδε μυροχθός, εἰ διστάσα τέ καὶ ἀπώλεια καὶ περιπλακισμός τῷ λαγων, λαγως διδόσκων καθηλόσ. It is a part of my Infelicity, to sit and professedly teach good Literature and Rhetorick, in a time when it is so neglected and disgraced. So, afterward he says he was afraid, lest the Greek Tongue should be Suppressed by some Law. Καὶ τάχε τῷ μητέραιον λαγων γῦν πλίον ἡ πρότερον πτήσιας τῇ στέρηπ, ὡς ἡμῖν καὶ φόβος ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς γεν-

Das

das μη εἰσπορεῖσθαι διὰς τύπον τῆτον παῖδεν. Ibid.
 p. 71. I shall not dispute whether the Constitutions of Clemens Romanus be his, or no; they are ancient, and in them it is enjoyned,
 'Abstain from all the Books of the Gentiles, for Lib. 1. c. 6.
 what have you to do with strange Discourses,
 or Laws, or False Prophets, which seduce weak
 Men from the Truth? In the Council of Carthage is there not a Canon, Let not a Bishop read Heathen Authors? And are not these, and the like Passages in Gratian? We see that the Priests of the Lord, neglecting the Gospels and the Prophets, read Comedies, and sing Love-Verses out of the Eucolicks; they peruse Virgil, and what is a Sin of enforced necessity in Children, is become their Delight. Dost not he seem to walk in Vanity and Darkness of Mind, who vexeth himself day and night in the Study of Logick; who in the pursuit of Physical Speculations, one while elevates himself beyond the highest Heavens, and afterwards precipitates himself below the nethermost parts of the Earth, and driveth into the Abyss; who frameth Iambicks, and chargeth his Memory with the distinct Knowledge of an Infinity of several sorts of Verses? If you say there is not now any danger of Infection from the reading of Heathenish Books; you give but the same reason for them, which Bellarmine does de Laicis, c. 20. Art. 19. and which is refuted as a Childish and Illiterate Answer by Jacobus Laurentius, since the Errors of the Heathen are not more manifest now, than of old; nor Men more fixed and constant. I could very far enlarge here,

Distinct.
 cap. 37.
 Episcopus
 citante Jac.
 Laurentio,
 de libr. gen.
 til. p. 40. 41.

here, and present you with the Romanists Apologies for expurging Books; but the Judgment and Practice of the Ancients may be learned very fully from the ensuing Testimonies of Men, as *Inquisitor*, and as *Knowing* as any latter Ages have produced.

Macchiavel, in his Disputations, l. 2. c. 5. saith, ‘The first Promoters and Founders of Christianity, were so assiduous and diligent in Extirpating the Superstitions of the Gentiles, that they commanded all Poets, and Historians, which contained any thing of that Nature, to be burned; they threw down their Idols, and destroyed every thing that had any smack of those Superstitions.

Cardan more particularly informs us, how Pope *Gregory* did burn many Latin Authors, because they were Lascivious, as *Cæcilianus*, *Affranus*, *Nevius*, *Licinius*, *Ennius*, *Attilius*, *Victor*, *Livi's Dialogues*; nor did they spare *Plautus*, *Martial*, and *Terence*, though through the multitudes of Copies their Pious Intentions were frustrated: Nor had *Tacitus*, for his contumelious Language against the Christians, escaped their Zeal, who is yet imperfect, but for the same reason. In like manner did *Gregory Nazianzen* suppress the Greek Authors, *Menander*, *Diphilus*, *Apolodorus*, *Philemon*, *Alexis*, *Sappho*. The great Traveller, and most Inquisitive, *Petrus Bellonius*, saith, That when he came to Mount *Atbos*, where there lived, in several Monasteries 6000 *Caloieri*, or Religious Persons, which are the greatest of any the Greek Church

De sapient,
lib. 2.

Observ. 1. 1.
c. 35.

Church hath, he did not find there (no nor
in all *Greece*) one Man that was Learned: *Ibid. c. 40.*
It is true, there were some who understood
Greek and *Latin*, but scarce Two or Three
which could Write and Read. In their *Cap. 39.*
Libraries they had several Manuscripts of
Divinity, but no *Poets*, *Historians*, or *Philo-* *Cap. 40.*
sophers. ‘For the *Patriarchs*, and other *Rulers*
of the *Greek Church*, being enemies to *Phi-*
losophy, did anathematize all such Priests
and Religious Persons, as should read or
transcribe any Book, but which were *Theo-*
logical: And did perswade all others that
it was not lawful for a Christian to study
Poesie or *Philosophy*: And such Ecclesiastical
Persons as had, by their Transgressing, in-
curred *Excommunication*, could not be Ab-
solved, till they had undergone sundry
strict *Fastings*, and other *Corporal Chastise-*
ments, and paid a Sum of Money by way
of *Pennance*. Yet art thou to understand,
Reader, that the *Greek Church* is owned
for a true Christian Church, and highly
magnified by Protestants, in opposition to
the Pope; yet neither they, nor the *Picards*,
or *Waldenses*, in *Bohemia*, did value Learning,
so far were they from esteeming of it as the
Prop of true Religion. *Luther. de
inflit. puer.
inter oper.
Wittenberg.
T. 2. f. 444.
cap. 1.*

XIX. Whose Sepulchres do our University-
Men build up, whilst they uphold Aristotle’s
Philosophy, which hath been so generally con-
demned of late, and heretofore, by Popish Assem-
blies, and particular Men of that way; as also
by

by the first Christians, and Honest Men of All Ages ?

The Apostle doth expressly tell us, That we ought to beware of Philosophy, Take heed lest any one seduce you by Philosophy, Col. 2. He had been at Athens, he had acquainted himself with that Vain-gloryous Humane Wisdom, which doth so interpolate the Truth, he had been conversant therewith, and knew the multiplicity of Contradictitious Sects which it had produced. What then hath Athens to do with Jerusalem ? What Fellowship hath the Academy with the Church of Christ ? What Agreement betwixt their Followers and the Disciples of our Lord Jesus ? Our Doctrine issues [not from the Stoicks, but] the Preach of Solomon ; who himself hath taught us, that God is to be sought in simplicity of Heart. Let them look to it, who have introduced a Stoical, a Platonical, a Logical Christianity. We need not be curious since the Coming of Jesus Christ, nor Inquisitive after the Light of the Gospel. Seeing we once believe, we have no further Intentments than to believe. For this is the first thing we do believe, that there is not any thing further that we should believe. Tertullian. de prescript. adv. Hæret. c. 7, 8. So Jerome, l. i. contr. Pelag. What hath Aristotle to do with Paul ? or Plato with Peter ? A multitude of Testimonies to this effect, might be produced out of Antiquity, to shew how bitter Censurers they were of Philosophy ;

Philosophy; how they triumphed in their *Faith*, and never so much employed their *Reason* as to Captivate it: Whatever it be now-a-days, to urge *Philosophy* amongst them, was either to be an *Heretick*, or a *Gentile*. But I refer my Reader to *Lannoy's Discourse*, about the several Conditions which *Aristotle* hath run thorough; there he will find him not only condemned by the Fathers, but burned by After-ages, and Papal Decrees. If any shall say, That the Apostle, by prohibiting *Philosophy*, and vain *Deceit*, doth rather establish, than prejudice what is true; I shall not only desire that Person to ascertain me of what is true in *Philosophy*; but further demand, whether this dealing, in making that *Distinctive* which is *Exaggerative*, be not like to what *Gregory de Valentia* alledgedeth in the behalf of that Worship which is paid to the *Host* in the *Mass*, that the Apostle, 1 Pet. 4. 3. in condemning of abominable *Idolatries*, *αἴρετοι εἰδωλολατρίας*, doth not prejudge *Idolatries*, which are not Abominable?

XX. Whether the first Christians had any *Churches* or did Assemble only in *private Houses*? (a) Whether their want hereof can be attributed to their being under *Persecution*, since they never made that excuse for themselves to the Pagans, who objected it to them? Whether, if it had not been their *Judgment*, and not a necessitous Practice, the Heathens would have

have upbraided them with such their defect; or upon that account have termed them Atheists.

(a) We read of a Church to be saluted in such and such a private House, Rom. 16. 5. 1 Cor. 16. 19. Col. 4. 15. Philem. 2. And it is evident by Celsus, objecting the want of them to the Christians in Origen; and Cecilius in Minutius Felix, that they had no Temples; by which they did not mean Heathen Temples, for the offering of Sacrifice, or the like Corporeal Ceremonies and Rites; but Churches, such as are now in use; for the same Objection is thus worded by Arnobius, in the beginning of his Sixth Book, 'For you use to charge us with Impiety in Minut. Fel. & Hos-
piian. de-
orig. templ. Vid. Ouzzel.
in Minut. & and Irreligiousness, because we build no Sacred
Houses or Temples for the performing of our
Deviotions and Worship therein. And this is
is avowed in the Controversie betwixt
the Lincoln-shire Puritan-Divines, and the
Canterburians, about the Altar, Name and
Thing.'

XXI. Whether Christianity it self be not
 (*) A.B. 28. 22. & A.B. termed Heresie in Scripture? (*) Whether Ter-
 24. 5. 14. tullian do not frequently call the Christians a
 (†) Terculli- Seet? (†) And whether the Christian Em-
 an de pat. 6. in Apolo- perors do not so likewise in their Consti-
 get. c. 1. l. tutions, even against Hereticks? (*) Whether
 &c. &c. 46. &c. alibi. the Meeting-Places of the first Christians were
 (*) Cod. Theodol. not termed Conventicles?
 lib. 16. tit. 5. de hereticis leg. 42. & leg. 57. & leg. 66. & alibi.

(a) Arnold.

(a) Arnob. l. 4. 'How have our Writings deserved to be burned, and our Conventicles ^{conventi-} to be barbarously destroyed, in which ^{cula.} we call upon the most high God ?'

Lactantius, lib. 5. c. 11. 'Some were fierce ^{cum ipso} paritur Con- to destroy them, as one in P^brygia, who venticulo.

'burned all the People assembled together, with their Conventicle. Orosius l. 7. c. 12. Honest Con- venticula.

'Trajan the Emperor being informed by Pliny, that the Christians did nothing contrary to the Roman Laws, but professed Christ, and frequented honest Conventions.'

XXII. Whether, if there were Heresies in the Apostles days, and Schisms, it doth follow that there are any Hereticks and Schismatics now, when there are no Apostles? It was unquestionably a culpable Election to embrace a Tenet different from what they taught, and a Schismatical and Criminal Departure to withdraw from their Churches or Assemblies, when they could refute the bold Gain-sayer a visum est Spiritui sancto & nobis, It seemeth meet unto the Holy Ghost, and to us: They being alive, the Heretick might as well inform himself of the meaning of their words, as their Miracles did convince the Truth of them: But is the case so now? Do the Miracles performed by the Apostles speak more in favour of one than another Opinionist? May not each one vouch them, who adheres to the Text? Is it sufficient Proof that a thing is so, because a Minister hath said it, whereas there is nothing which they may not say?

say? And is it not as good Proof against a thing, Some Minister or Ministers, advantaged with as good Topical Recommendations as his or their Adversary, hath denied it? (a)

(a) What Credit is to be given to the *Decisions of Men*, you may learn from the first Protestants, who being condemned by the Papists, as vilely as they censure others, did notwithstanding bear up in that Satisfaction (which our Hereticks have) that *their own Consciences did not condemn them.* From them who undertook to define as Apostles, they demanded the like Signs, before they would submit to the exercise of the like Jurisdiction. But what Signs do you think *Luther* found at the *Sorbonne?* How resembling are they to what are at the Two Universities? Thus *Luther* makes them to plead in defence of that *Condemnation* they had passed upon him: ‘When the Faculty Theological condemned that Heretick, we had two sorts of *Signs*; some answering to the common Signs of *Barnabas* and *Paul* amongst the Gentiles; and some corresponding with the peculiar Signs of *Peter*: Because Manners teach us to begin with the most worthy, we shall speak of such Signs as answer to those of *Peter*. And let it be thus: The *Dean* of our worthy Faculty, he is *St. Peter* in the worthy Faculty; and he hath Three Signs which force him to judge, so that he cannot err: His *Register Book*, his *Zel*, and his *Formalities*. From whence it is clear, that

that the Heretick [Melancthon] did proudly and arrogantly to write against the Worthy Faculty. The Common Signs are these: For Example, Our other Masters, especially the most excellent John a Nokes and John a Styles, are Paul and Barnabas, in the worthy Faculty. Now their First and Great Sign is Doctoral-Hood [Liripipum, seu ut cruditi dicunt, Relipendum] which is a most evident and known Sign, from whence we so conclude, That Man hath an Hood; therefore he is our Master, illuminated in the Faith; and therefore be bath the Holy Ghost. Another Sign is, they sit in an high Seat or Chair, when they do read or dispute: And from this Sign we thus argue: Christ says, They sit in Moses's Chair, whatever they say, that observe ye; therefore whatever they say is true. But these our Masters sit in the Chair, and teach thus, therefore they cannot err.

There is another Sign which is very comprehensive; and it is the Ring, Gloves, Kiss, &c. which they give and receive in the Doctors-Hall, together with the expensive Doctrinal Banquet.. The last and greatest Sign is, the entry of Mr. Dean in the Sorbonne, when the Bedels go before him with their Staves; and cry aloud, Room for our reverend and excellent Master, the Dean of the Faculty of Theology, and our other excellent Masters, Room, Room: And this is a Sign well to be rummated on, for it concludes Formally, that our Masters cannot err.

These are
Oxon Customs too.

For as in the like manner it is concluded, that the Pope cannot mistake, by this Argument *very formally*; because six lusty Fellows carry him at noon-day, with great solemnity from his Palace, thorough a good broad Street; how can he mistake, being so carried, the Day being clear, and the Street broad? So our Masters cannot mistake, because they go so solemnly at Mid-day, the Way being good, and Bedels going before them with their Staves. And these are sufficient Signs, gloriously proved for the Honour of the Faculty of Divinity.

Lud. Luther. in op. Luth. t. 2. fol. 199. c. 2. edit. Witeberg.

XXIII. Whether they used in the Primitive Times to Bury in places, such as we now call Church-yards? (a) And whether the introducing of such a Custom had not a Superstitious Original?

(a) *Gaudentius de mor. sec. Justin.* proves that they did of old, Bury privately their Dead in their Grounds: 'Which Custom (he says) was taken away by Pope Innocent the Third, afterwards; he prohibited that any should cause themselves to be buried in new and un-consecrated [minus Religiosa] places, forsaking the Churches and Sepulchers of Fathers. The Pope draws his Argument from the Example of the Fathers, in the Old Testament, who are said to have been gathered unto their Fathers. But by the Custom of Justinian's Age,

where any Man was buried, that was a Consecration or Hallowing of it; nor was the Example of the Patriarch obligatory: In the time of *Justinian*, and before, it was not Lawful to Bury the Dead in Churches: c. 27. For which end there is extant a *Law* of *Gratian*, *Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*, l. 2. c. *de sacros. Eccles.* yea, the *Fathers* did take a special care, that no Dead Bodies should be buried in Churches; to which end there are several Canons made by *Synods* [*Triburiens. Nannetens. Vafen. Synodi decreta.* *Canon. quibus. Canon. nullus. canon. præcipiens.* *dum*] Even the Emperors were not buried in Churches.—The being buried in the Church-Porch, and near it, was out of a Superstitious Respect to the Saint, whose name that Church did bear: And when they began to desire to be buried within the Church, the reason was, because their Kindred and Relations did pray for them there: Besides, they did hope to be benefited by the Merits of the *Martyrs* and *Apostles*. We read in *Austin*, ‘That the Believing Mother did desire, that the Body of her Believing Son might be buried in the Church of the Martyrs; for so much as she did believe that his Soul did reap benefit thorough the Merits of the said Martyrs.’ In *Gaudent. c. 30.* the latter end of *Justinian’s Reign*, or not long after his Death, the Custom and Laws for not Burying People within Churches began to be disused; so that *Valerianus*, a Gentleman of *Brixia*, bought for a Sum of

Vide Duran.
dum de ri-
tib. Eccl.
Cathol. l. 1.
c. 23.

De cura pro
mortuis. c. 5.

' Money from the Bishop, to be buried within the Church ; which Prerogative the Clergy did, upon their first Retrenchment upon the Laws, appropriate to themselves.

G How much there is of this Superstition in England now, and what excessive Rates are payed for breaking up the Ground in Churches, and the several parts thereof; as thou mayest easily enquire, Reader, so thou mayest hence inform thy self of the cause. Hospinian saith, That Men became at last so Superstitious in being buried in, or near, the Church ; that they thought it material, even to their Salvation. And gives another Reason why they, nor any should Bury the Dead in the Church : Because that Vapours arising from Buried Carcasses naturally, and also thorough the heat of a Multitude assembled, are prejudicial to Women with Child, or any that are Sickly.

It was one of the Articles of the Wal-

denses. *ed. 1603. lib. 1. c. 1.*
The use of Church-Yards is Superfluous, and invented only for Lucre sake : It is no matter in what Ground any one is buried.

Bishop Usher *de success. Eccles. Chriſt. c. 6.*

XXIV. Whether amongst the Papists, that have Churches, or solemn Meeting-places ; the Jesuits do not usually, notwithstanding that, preach in the Market-places and Streets ? (a) What it is that makes Teaching a publick Act ? If to Teach publickly be to Teach accordingly as it is now practised, whether the Apostles did ever Teach publickly ?

(a) This

*De orig.
temp. 3.
c. 1.*

(a) This Liberty was granted to them by Pope Paul the Third; the same is practised by the Friers Minors and Dominicans, and Agustine Friers; and grounded upon the practice of the Prophets in the Old Testament, Jer. 17. Amos 5. Prov. 1. and of Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament; besides that, Mat. 22. & Luke 14. in the Parable of the Marriage, Christ sends them out to the High-ways and Streets for Guests. All this is illustrated at large by *Franciscus Bernardinus*, a Popish Doctor, in his Book, *de ratiu concionandi lib. 2. c. 24.* and confirmed by this Reason, ‘It is indeed an excellent Work to Preach the Gospel to such as sit idle in the Market, and would not otherwise go to Church, and to instruct and reform them.

XXV. Whether the Division into Parishes was not introduced by Pope Dionysius? (a) And whether the Ancient Christians paid Tithes? If they did, whether they did not pay them as Alms? (a)

I mean not here such *Parishes* as ours are now, for there was no such thing till after *Justinian*; the Settlement was this only, In a Town there was one *Bishop*, with so many *Assisting Presbyters*, who officiated in the voluntary Assemblies of *Christians*; the Offerings of all which Assemblies were distributed by the *Bishop* amongst the *Presbyters* in common. But thus in the same Street there might be a *Parish* of the *Orthodox*, of the *Arians* and *Novatians*, &c. It being a *Parish* of *Persons*, and not a *possession* of such Houses and Lands, with *Tithes* from all in general.

(a) Some say, That the Division of Parishes was the effect of one of the *Lateran Councils*; the eldest whereof was 1180. Cambden, in his Division of Scotland. Others attribute it to Pope *Dionysius*, about

the Year 566. For which *Robert of Tibes*, c. 8. p. 64. cites inter Decret. *Dyonis.* & caus. 13. qu. *Cambden* saith, That *Dyonisius* did only distribute into *Diocesses* the Bishops.

(b) Were *Tithes* exacted for the Maintenance of the *Priests* in the Time of the Emperor *Justinian*? Certainly he will deny it, who remembers that there is not any mention made of them in *Code* (or Compilation of Laws, made in the days of him, and precedent Emperors, for the Regiment of all *Christians*) in which, for all that there are several Constitutions about *Bishops*, *Clergy-Men*, and *Churches*: If you have recourse to *Oecumenical Councils*, you will be at a loss there, and scarce find any thing for your satisfaction. Yet we must not think that the Bishops and Clergy were then destitute of Maintenance ; for it is necessary they be maintained, yet may the payment of *Tithes* be omitted, if provision be made otherwise for them. But though we find nothing of *Tithes* in the *Code*, nor in the *Authenticks* of *Justinian*; yet I do not think that no *Tithes* were payed in those days; for long before that time, many Passages fell from *Austin*, (as it is in *Gratian* caus. 16. q. 1. c. decimæ) whence it appears, That the Christians did at first give *Tithes* upon no other account nor manner than they did *Alms*: For thus that holy Man speaks, ‘*As many poor Men as die for hunger, in the place where be lives, thorough his not giving the Tenthis, of the Death of so many*

many Persons will be found guilty before the
 Tribunal of the Eternal Judge. And a little
 before, he had said, 'Wilt thou give that
 to the wicked Soldier, which thou wilest not
 give to the Priest? Thus Tithes, being payed
 by the perswasion of the Bishop, were di-
 stributed for the Maintenance of the Priest
 and Poor, yet were not the Christians to be
 enforced by the Judge for the payment, or
 donation of such Tithes; and therefore
 Justinian hath not recorded any thing
 thereto, appertaining in his Laws. More-
 over, in the Council of Gangra, which was
 held in the Year 314. These two Canons
 are Registered: 'If any one shall either receive canon 7.
 or give Offerings out of the Church, without
 the knowledge of the Bishop, or him whose
 Office it was to receive them, and shall refuse
 to consult with them, let him be Anathema.
 And if any shall give or receive Offerings be-
 sides the Bishop, or his Deputy, constituted to
 that purpose, for to dispense Alms to the Poor,
 let both the giver and the receiver be Anathema.
 Which Canons are expounded by Pope Sym-
 machus, concerning Tithes: Whence we may
 learn, That the Christians did in old times
 use to give something voluntarily out of
 their Incomes, which was divided by the
 Bishop, partly to the Clergy, and partly to
 the Poor. And those things which were
 at first arbitrarily payed, thorough inveterate
 Custom and Usage, became necessary and
 enforceable. Hence was the Original of all
 those Laws, concerning the manner of pay-
 ing

ing *Tithes*, and the means to compel the refusers thereof, of which the Canonists treat so much, and especially Pope *Gregory*, decretal. *l. 3. c. 30. Gaudent. de moribus secul. Justinian Cap. 23.*

Mr. Selden, in his *History of Tithes*, saith, That before the Year 800, or thereabouts, there is not any general Law, that yet remains in publick, and is of credit, which ordained any payment of Tenth in the Western-Church: For, in the Eastern, never any Law, that I have observed, mentions them. p. 67. and in the Council of *Latteran*, of 1215. a Relation is of some Nations, who although Christians, did not by their own Rites and Customes pay *Tithes*.

Summa pars.
3. tit. 4.

These are observed, by *Innocent* the fourth, to have been *Greeks*, *Armenians*, and the like. And *Antonius* expressly remembers the general non-payment of them in the Eastern-Church, as a thing not to be censured to be against God's Law. Neither indeed have I met with any Canon Law of all that Church that ever commanded *Tithes*. Ibid. p. 190. And Neither can I but here remember that Custom of the Eastern-Church, thus maintained chiefly with Offerings, or *Almoechies*, as they call them; which specially appears in the answer of *Theodore Balsamon*, Patriarch of *Antiochia*, to *Mark*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, touching the quantity of what was to be offered. He tells him that no certain quantity is appointed by the Canons, and that through inequality

quality of Mens Estates (none of them giving any such part to the Church, as that it could discover their abilities) which permits not a regular certainty, they were contented with what Custom, and what the free Bounty of the Givers bestowed. Ἐπεὶ δὲ (faith he) οὐκέτι πραγμάτων ἀνομαλία καὶ ἔδη τῶν τίταν εἰσάλυτεν ταπετύπωσιν (πολλοστηρέσιον γέρε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰσιστοῦσιν ἢ ἀποκρυπτοῦσιν) αρχήμενα τῆς οἰκουνέσσαι καὶ πραγμάτων σὺν διδόντων, which is in substance the same before in English, p. 245. in opposition to what Mr. Selden, Doctor Tillefley says, and proves, that in the Greek-Church the First-fruits were Due, and might be exacted from the Laity in Money or Kind. The Ecclesiastical Canons of that Church, defined nothing particularly of the quantity of the *Canonicum*, which was given by the People, but the Emperor, *Isaacius Comnenus*, set down a form thereof, what by *Lay-men* of the Diocesses should be given to the Bishop: In fine, Mr. Selden in his review of Dr. Tillefley's Animadversions, states the Controversie about the Eastern-Church, not as if they had never there payed *Tithes*; but, that they had no Laws to enforce them: So that they may have been said not to have pay'd, but given them: And so the proofs on both sides may be reconciled.

Concerning *Tithes* in the Greek-Church, *la Mestre* gives an account, Part 2. l. 1. c. 6. whereof this is the Sum: Of *Tithes* there is so little mention amongst the Greeks, that it is questionable

questionable whether their Lands were ever obnoxious to any. For amongst so many Monuments of Antiquity, so many Laws and Canons, there is not the least mention, or footprint thereto found. So that we may suppose, that if there were any memorial or use of them before Justinian, who digested and modelled their *Laws*, all was then abrogated. Some slender mention is found amongst some Greek Fathers, but as gratuitously given, not as constantly and by way of Due paid: For this he cites *Origen*, hom. 11. in *num. Isidor. Pelusiot. Ep. 37.* l. 1. the other Greek Fathers seldom mention them, or not at all; nor are they recounted amongst the Maintenance of the Clergy. Thus *Epiphanius*, Tom. 2. l. 3. bref. 80. speaking wherewith the Priests ought to be sustained and clothed, mentions First-fruits and Offerings, but names not *Titbes*. *Gregorius Nazienzen*, Ep. 80. tells *Aerius* and *Alypius*, not that *Titbes* are Due to God, but the First-fruits of the Wine-press and the Barn. And under the Emperor *Heraclius A. D. 614.* *Antiochus* Abbot of St. *Laura*, in an Homily concerning First-fruits, commends the paying of *Titbes*, but challengeth that of First-fruits, only as due. My Author thinks they declined the mention of *Titbes*, or *Tenths*, because the Emperors Tribute was exacted therein, so that to have urged or named them, would have alarmed the People, as if they should be *Vassals* to their *Priests*, as well as *Emperors*. But instead of *Titbes*, their Clergy was maintained, partly by

by casual Emergencies from *Benedictions*, *Marriages* and *Burials*, and partly by a fixed Salary, collected from each House or Chimney; and it was called *Capnicum*, or *Chimney-Money*: And it was the way of collecting hereof, that *Iсааcius Comnenus*, in his Bull doth give orders for ; and this Money being payed only to the Bishops, was called *Canonicum*, or *Episcopale Tributum*. It was not instituted, but modelled by *Comnenus*, 1057. being παλαιὸς τύπος, an old *Sanction*. It was payed partly in Money, and partly in Kind: How the Curates and Parish-Priests were maintained, we read not: But my Author thinks they had a *Canonicum* too; for *Nicholaus* the Patriarch, when the People refused to pay a *Canonicum* to the Parish-Priests, the Law being silent as to them, and mentioning only Bishops, ordained that the old *Sanctions* be renewed; and as the Priests payed to the Bishop for their Ordination, so they should pay for their Instruction much more; and that either in Kind or Money. Thus they were maintained after *Justinian's* time ; but before they were maintained, partly by *Pensions cut of the Exchequer*, as the other Officers of the Empire, partly by the Benevolence of the Parishioners and Casualties. And thus the Greek Clergy was maintained till 1200. Then the Latines under pretence of re-gaining the *Holy Land*, under *Baldwin*, took *Constantinople*, made him Emperor, settled the *Romish* Doctrine and Customs, and particularly that of *Tithes*,

Tithes, though the Nobility opposed it, and prohibited their Vassals to pay them. Yet were they violently settled in a great part of *Greece*, until the *Turks* subdued that Empire. And now their *Clergy* is maintained, each Priest by a Salary from his Auditors Yearly, (every Church having so many Houses attributed to it) called *χρόνικον*: Besides what they get for Burials, &c. and some of them practise Handy-craft Trades, and some have Lands given them by Men at their Death. *Vid. Garlach. Epist. ad Cancellar. Acad. Tubing.*

Maii 17. 1576.

It is further observable out of what hath been related, that of old, *Tithes* nor *Offerings* were not payed (or given) to the Presbyters, or Priests in the Country or City, but to the Bishop, or his Deputy, who was *Oeconomus* or *Steward*, to distribute them to the Presbyters and Poor. The Presbyters (*Urban* or *Rural*) were designed to the Employment by the Bishop, and at the beginning they were of the Bishops Family, and did live of the *Sportula* [i. e. of the *Oblation of the Church*] before the distinction of Parishes came up; so saith Bp. *Andrews* in his Letter to *D. Moulin*, of Episcopacy, p. 18. Which is more fully delivered by Mr. *Selden* (and confessed by Dr. *Tillefly*, that it is not improbable to have been so) 'That as *Metropolitick Sees, Patriarchates, (Exarchates in the Eastern-Church)* and *Bishopricks*, those greater Dignities, were most usually at first ordained, and limited according to the

the distinction of Seats of Government,
 and inferior Cities, that had been assign'd
 to the Substitutes or *Vicarii* of the *Praefecti-*
prætorio, or Vice-Roys of the East and
 West Empire, so were Parishes appointed
 and divided to several Ministers within
 the Ecclesiastical Rule of those Dignities,
 according to the conveniences of Country-
 Towns and Villages; one, or more, or less,
 (of such as being but small Territories,
 might not by the Canons, be Bishopricks)
 to a Parish; the word *Paræcia* or *Parish*, at
 first denoting a whole Bishoprick (which
 is but a great Parish) and signifying no
 otherwise than *Diocess*. But afterward be-
 ing confined to what our Common Lan-
 guage restrains it, the *Curates* of those
 Parishes were such as the Bishop appointed
 under him to have care of Souls in them,
 and those are they which the old Greek
 Councils call πρεσβύτεροι ἐπίχεροι οἱ ἐν ταῖς
 χωμαῖς, or ἐν ταῖς χωμαῖς πρεσβύτεροι: That is,
Presbyteri Parochiani, within the Bishoprick.
 These had their Parishes assigned them,
 and in the Churches where they kept their
 Cure, the Offering of Devout Christians
 were received, and disposed of, in Main-
 tenance of the Clergy, and Relief of di-
 stressed Christians, by the *Oeconomi* Dea-
 cons, or other Officers thereto appointed
 under the Bishop. Neither had those Pa-
 rochial Priests at first such a peculiar in-
 terest in the profits received in Oblations,
 as of later time. All that was received,

where-

' wheresoever in the Bishporick, was as a
 ' Common Treasury to be so dispensed.
 ' One part was allowed for the Maintenance
 ' of the Ministry (out of which every Pa-
 ' rochial Minister had his Salary) accord-
 ' ing to a Collection Monthly made for the
 ' ends specified, and arbitrarily given, and
 ' called *Stipes*, which is a word borrowed
 ' from the use of the Heathens in their Col-
 lections made for their Temples and Dei-
 ties ; another to the Relief of the Poor,
 ' and Sick, and Strangers ; a third to the
 ' Reparation of Churches ; and a fourth to
 ' the Bishop. So it appears by the ancient
 ' Canons, if we may at least herein con-
 ' jecture, of the use of the time, by what
 ' they have ordained. *Selden of Tithes*, c. 6.
 ' p. 80, 81.

XXVI. If Tithes under the Levitical Law
 were not payed immediately to this or that
 Levite and Priest, but were brought into a
 common Barn and Treasury, and thence
 distributed according to the Exigencies of the
 several Priests, as they were * : And if

under the Primitive Christians, the Collection of
 voluntary Tithes and Of-
 ferings was brought to
 the Bishop, and disposed
 of by him or his Depu-
 ty, unto the several offici-
 ating Presbyters, Urban and Rural ; as it
 was * :

* Philo Judæus de sacerdot. honor.
 Left any should upbraid the Priest
 with their Maintenance, they are
 commanded to bring their first-fruits
 to the Temple first, and thence the
 Priests receive them.

was : Why is there such a Clamour against the management of Tithes now by the Parliament, since the inequality of the present distribution is manifest, and the Equity of such dealing is justified by these Examples from being the suggestion of Politicians, nor are there any new emergent difficulties, other than might be objected then?*

* This is confessed by all that write of *Tithes*, and know any thing of antiquity, and *Nicolaus de Maistre*, saith, That as a remainder of the ancient Custom, in many Bishopricks, even to this day, the whole profits of the several Parishes is brought to the Bishop, who out of that doth maintain the Parish-Priests and Curates, viz. In *Episcopali Albiensi, & alii Narbonensis provinciae id sit.* Nic. la Maitre *de bonis eccles.* l. 2. c. 10. p. 230.

XXVII. *Whether any Heathen did pay Tithes to Christian Ministers under the first Christian Emperors? Whether any Excommunicate (who were to be as Heathen) did pay Tithes? Whether any Catechumeni did, or only the perfect acknowledg'd Believers? Whether Schismaticks, and such as did recede from the general Assemblies, did pay Tithes to those Assembly-Preachers, which they relinquished? And, Whether it was ever taught that any, or all these ought to pay Tithes, as is specified?*

That none of all this was done, seems clear; for there being no Law, they were not compellable; nor indeed could there be any Equity in it, that because *The Labourer was worthy of his Hire*, therefore they who never did hire him, should pay him. Besides, *Tithes* being voluntarily payed under the Christian Emperors, during the

M subsistence

subsistence of a *Toleration* (and there is nothing that makes it not so now, but some Laws not irrepealable) each Assembly maintained their *Bishops* and *Clergy*; so that in one City you might have found an *Arrian*, a *Novatian*, and an *Orthodox Clergy*; yea, *Jewish Synagogue*, and an *Heathen Temple*, all maintained by voluntary contribution.

XXVIII. If Tithes are of Divine Right, then are they payable only to the Clergy labouring in the Ministry; and then must not all Appropriations and Appropriations, in whose Hands soever, be taken away? And would not this as much prejudice the *Universities*, as if the Anabaptists, &c. were gratified with their *Abolition*? And doth it not condemn all the practice of the Ancients who divided Tithes, to the Poor in moyety, as well as to the Presbyter?

XXIX. Whether the Predecessors of the Protestants, and those who have so Honourable a mention in our Books of Martyrs, and other Writings, for witnessing against Popish and Anti-christian Abuses, did allow of Tithes and their Divine Right? (a)

(a) The *Bohemians* (being descended from the *Waldenses*) did profess that all Priests ought to be Poor, and to be content with Alms alone. So saith *Aeneas Silvius* in his *Bohemian History*, as it is cited by Bp. *Usher*, *de chr. eccles. success. c. 6. p. 155.* who also (p. 169.) voucheth a passage out of *Alanus*

nus, l. 2. contr. Waldensii, shewing that their Opinion was, 'That the Clergy ought not to labour with their own hands, but to be supplied with necessaries by them to whom they preached; which they endeavoured to prove by sundry Texts. For the Apostle saith to the Corinthians, Who goeth to War at his own Charges? Who plants a Vine, and eateth not of the Fruit thereof? Who feeds a Flock, and eateth not of the Milk thereof? &c. One of the Articles of John Wickliff, for which he was censur'd, is, That Tithes are pure Alms, and that the Parishioners may for the Offence of their Curates, detain and keep them back, and bestow them upon others, at their own Will and Pleasures.

*Acta and
Mon. p. 435.*

And the Proposition aforesaid is at large defended by John Hus's, in the said Book of Martyrs, p. 461, &c. And in the conclusion of the Discourse it is affirmed, That the Clergy are not Lords and Possessors of Tithes, or other Ecclesiastical Goods, but only Stewards; and after the Necessity of the Clergy is once satisfied, they ought to be transported to the Poor.

At Geneva, Tithes of all sorts are taken up for the use of the State, and laid up in the publick Treasury, and Stipends issued out to maintain the Ministry; but those so mean, that Beza's Stipend, whilst he lived, hardly amounted to 80*l.* per Annum; the Residue of the City Ministers not to 60*l.* those of the Villages adjoyning having hardly 40*l.* But the State doth make some allowance

*Vid. Heylin's Geog.
descript. of
Geneva.*

allowance to the Wives and Daughters of their deceased Ministers, if they die poor, or leave their Children unprovided for ; or otherwise have deserved well in their Life-time. In *Holland* they are likewise maintained by Pensions from the State ; as also in the *Palatinate* ; and I believe in all the *Reformed Churches*, universally, not including the *Lutherans* in that number.

Adr. Saravia de honore presulibus debito c. 10.

Adrianus Saravia professeth, That the Levitical Exaction of Tithes is ceased ; and that Christians voluntarily pay what the Jewish Nation were enforced to. All that he holds to be Moral, is, That the Ministry be maintained : Upon the Quota, or determinate Tenth, he insists not ; since he thinks, that the Christians should rather heighten than only equal the Gratitude of the Jews towards their Priests ; since the Spiritual Mercies, which are conveyed unto them by the Ministers, exceed whatever that Nation did partake of. He thinks that Con-

*Ibid. c. 13. flantine did give Tents to the Churches, and that That is the meaning of those Incomes [Vectigalia] which that Emperor is said to have given ; not that he should give them as Jewish, but as a Civil Sanction ; it being the custom of the Romans to impose their Taxes after that manner. In like manner Charlemain having subdued the Saxons, and put their King *Widekindus* to flight ; he laid upon them a Tax for the Tents, part whereof he gave to his Nobles, and part to the Bishop. This Passage and Observation*

servation of Saravia, makes me think, that the Usage of the Romans, to exact the Tenths from such Nations as they conquered, by way of Tribute, may have as much advanced the enforcement of Titbes, as the Levitical Constitutions, which were urged by the Fathers, only to press the Equity of the thing, not to compel by their Example. For thus Saravia, 'If any shall object that Oblations, as well as Titbes, and other legal Sacrifices, are ceased: I would have him to know, that it is not affirmed that they are to be exacted after the same manner now, as they were then; nor were they so demanded by the Fathers: But they are to be given as Testimonies of our Gratitude towards God, and Love towards the Pastors of the Church; which Duty is not founded upon a Temporary, but Perpetual Law, which indubitably binds all Believers, as long as they are in this World. This being the Claim then which he allows for Titbes, I cannot but commend him for not insisting upon the Quota, or Determinate Part; since Gratitude obligeth not a Man to this or that Gift particularly, but that he make his acknowledgments according to his ability. In England, after the Reformation, neither King Edward the Sixth, nor Queen Elizabeth, own the Divine or Moral Right of Titbes, but deny the Clergy to have any Propriety in them; and what they receive beyond necessary Supplies, is by them both ad-

Ibid. c. 30.

Injunct. of
K. Ed. 6.
§. 18. Of
Q. Eliz.
§. 15.

judged to the Poor: They both declare, That none shall detain his Tithes, for as much as by Lawes Established, every Man is bound to pay them: And they both declare, That the Goods of the Church are called the Goods of the Poor; whereby they mean, that they are really so, (which was the opinion of J. Hus, already cited) for thereupon they Ordain, That such Parsons, Vicars, Prebendaries, &c. as receive Tithes and Church-Incomes, and do not reside upon their Benefices, to dispend there, and practise Charity to the Poor, shall distribute amongst their Poor Parishioners, and other Inhabitants there, in the presence of the Church-Wardens, or some other honest Men of the Parish, the Fortieth Part of the Fruits and Revenues of their said Benefices, lest they be worthily noted of Ingratitude; which, reserving to themselves, cannot vouchsafe to impart the Fortieth Portion thereof among the Poor People of that Parish, that is so fruitful and profitable unto them: And they do farther enjoyn, That every Clerk, or Beneficed Person, having Yearly to dispend in Benefices, and other Promotions of the Church, an hundred Pounds, shall give 3 l. 6 s. 8 d. in Exhibition to one Scholar in any of the Universities; and for as many Hundreds of Pounds as he may dispend, to so many Scholars more shall be give the like Exhibition: As also,

K. Ed. §. 14. Q. Eliz. §. 11. That such Proprietaries and Parsons shall lay out the Fifth Part of their Benefices, till they be repaired; and after, should maintain them in good state. It is clear, that if they had reput'd the Quota, or determinate Tenth,
K. Ed. §. 25. Q. Eliz. §. 12.
Ibid. §. 16. Ibid. §. 13.

to be Morally Due, or by Divine Right, they could not have made these Laws or Injunctions: But *the Goods of the Clergy, being the Goods of the Poor,* and they being no Proprietors, but Stewards, these Princes might regulate the Charity of such Beneficed Persons, without Violation of Property. From the Injunction aforesaid (from the Enquiries under the Bishops, which were made accordingly at their *Visitations*) I shall Remark what the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* save, in Comparison of the old *Episcopal Clergy*, they being not bound now (nor practising) to dispend, or give to the Poor, the Fortieth Part of their Benefices, or to give such proportions to poor *Scholars*; nor have I heard they were ever impleaded before the Triers hereupon.

This saying of theirs, That *the Goods of the Church are the Goods of the Poor;* which is to be understood definitely of *Tithes, Glebe-lands and Offerings*, puts me in mind of a new Question, viz. *Whose is the Property of Church-Goods?* That private Persons now possessed thereof, are not the Proprietors, is clear; since they cannot alienate or dispose of them as they will. And *Austin*, speaking of Church-lands attributed to his Bishoprick, saith, *Nostis enim fratres, quia ville istae non sunt Augustini, August. tract. 6. in Joan. Leo X. being Pope in the Laterane Council, Sess. 9. in Bulla Reform. cur. doth by the consent of that Council, declare himself Proprietor, and that he hath a plenary*

nary Disposition of all Profits and Emoluments; accruing to Churches Cathedral and Metropolitical, Monasteries, and all other Ecclesiastical Benefices, as he is Pope pro tempore. If this be so, then our supreme Magistrate, as vested with whatever Power was ascribeable to the Pope in *Henry the Eighth's* time, is Proprietor of them, and hath the Plenary Disposition of them. But setting aside the Consideration of what Power is placed in the Pope, by the *Canonists*, the *Lateran Council*, and General Practice of that Court, (which yet is very material, in reference to what Property our Common Laws are to determine of) *Ambrose*, Bishop of *Mil-lain*, and as hot a stickler for Church-Privileges, as we hardly read of his like, saith, *Agros [ecclesiae] si desiderat Imperator potestatem habet vindicandorum, nemo nostrum intervenit: potest pauperibus collatio populi redundare.* Non facient de agri invidiam: tollant eos si libitum est, *Ambroſ. ep. 32.* If the Emperor have a mind to Church-lands, be hath power to take them, there is none of us interposeth; the Poor may be sufficiently maintained by popular Collections. Let them not create us envy by talking of those Lands, but let them take them away, if they please. I shall observe, first, that in those days the Ministry was not maintained by a fered Tithe, like to that in our times, but by voluntary Oblations of the People, and by such Lands as were given to several Churches by the Emperors, and the Benevolence of Well-disposed Christians, together with Con-giaries

giaries, or Distributions of Corn and other Provisions, of the Emperor's allowance. It is upon this account that he speaks only of Church-lands; and would you know who is in his judgment the Proprietor of them? It is the Emperor: He hath Power to take them away. Would you know whose use they are for? When he tells you, that if they be taken away, the Poor may be supplied by Popular Collections, you cannot doubt that the Lands were for their use; or if you can, the same Author,
ep. 13. will inform you directly, *possessio Ecclesiae sumptus est egenorum*: What the Church possesseth, it is for the Maintenance of the Poor. If this be so (of which the most perverse Opponent may be satisfied out of *Antonius de Dominis*, Bishop of Spalato, *de rep. eccles.* l. 9.) I do not see how the Quakers, and others, who have petitioned against Tithes, do overthrow Property. For if the Property thereof be vested in the Parliament, as supreme, whether Primarily, or by virtue of that Act which did settle the Papal Power upon our English Kings, to petition, That they would abolish Tithes, is not to destroy their Property, but to desire they would otherwise dispose of it: And whilst they own the Authority of the Common-Wealth, and the others complot for the overthrow of it; we need not seek far in discovery of who would subvert Property, as far as Tithes are concerned therein. In fine, since without a subversion of Property

erty, our Ministers received them from *Papists* that were ejected, and to whom they were given by the *Donors*, with such Curses as extend not to the second remove, I cannot imagine how Propriety will suffer by another disposal of them. Some make God to be the Proprietor of Church-Lands and Profits, as being given to him: But since (as the Form runs in *la Maistre de bon. Eccles.* part 1. l. 2. c. 7.) they were given to him *out of hope of future Retribution, or to merit Pardon of Sin;* and since he doth not transact with the Sons of Men upon those terms, it is certain God did never receive them, and so is not Proprietor; at least, it is a thing not yet revealed. Some make God to be the Proprietor of Tithes in a Moral Right, for Divine Positive Right there is none for this Plea; and to this they tell us of Abraham's paying Tithes to Melchizedee, being Priest to the Most High. And how Jacob vowed the Tenth of all the Lord should give him; and the Gentiles by Natural Instinct did pay them to their god. But to resume the last, as it is not denied, That in Italy, Greece, and the East, (from whence the Customs were Propagated to the other two; and so it is but a single Proof, not the Voice of Nature) upon several occasions, the Tenth were given to their gods; so we cannot grant it to have proceeded from any Instinct of the Natural Conscience in Man: For neither do we Experiment an Inbred Notion in our selves, nor the Reformed Churches,

no not at Geneva; nor did the Primitive Times any where, nor the Greek Church to this day; which is a sufficient Opposition to the Casual Practice of a few Nations acting blindly and Superstitiously; And if the Proof alledged from them may suffice, to prove the Tenth to be God's by Proprietary, one may bring as much to prove that the Tenth doth appertain to the civil Magistrate, for that was a more Universal and Constant Practice than the other. As appears from *Montague* against *Selden*, and *La Maistre de bon. Eccles.* part 2. l. 11c. l. As for the Parenthesis of a Story concerning *Melchizedec*, I think it proves, no more than *Jacob's* Vow, which is only matter of Fact, but not Right. But supposing God to be Proprietor, it doth not follow that the Abolishing of Tithes, by Act of Parliament, doth subvert Property. For seeing that our Goodness extends not to God, except it can be made out to whom God hath assigned the Receipt of his Tenth, the paying of it to any is an Alienation, and not the detaining them. If because *Melchizedec* received them as Priest, therefore Priests are to receive them; What is this to them who are not Priests? For that there is a Priesthood under the Gospel, is a Discovery which no Primitive Age, nor the *Albigenses*, *Luther*, *Salmasius*, &c. could yet admit. Are they payable to others besides Priests? What proof is there of that? Nature, the Scripture and Custom, all are silent as to that. The case being thus

thus, And seeing that the Christian Emperors did seize upon the *Pagan-Temple-Revenues* (without suffering them to revert to the Heirs of the Donors ; for *Respondit Modestinus*, the Civil Lawyer in those days, being asked his advice, said, That ought not to be, *Digest. l. 33. tit. 2. de usu & usu fructu legatis leg. 16.*) and did distribute of them to the Maintenance of the Soldiery, and other uses, as to be given to some for Inheritances, or to defray the Domestick Charge of the Court, or to endow Christian-Churches, as they pleased, *Cod. Theod. libr. 16. tit. 10. de paganis. leg. 19, & 20.* And since they are the *Goods of the Poor* avowedly, as is confessed, if the Parliament, do take care that there be no *Poor* in our Gates, they shall do a more Noble Act ; then if they continue those Revenues, though better managed than they are by the *Presbyterian Canons of Cb. Cb. in Oxon.* to the *Students* and *Alms-Men*, or else-where by any *griping Parson*.

I shall not enlarge any farther upon this point, only for the defence of such in our times, as would reduce the Ministry to a Maintenance by a voluntary Contribution, and abolish Tithes, I shall represent intirely, as it is set down in the *Book of Martyrs*, the Judgment of Mr. *William Thorp* ; and since the *Martyrologer* doth call him a *Warriour, valiant under the Triumphant Banner of Christ*, and reproveth him not as an Enemy to the *Gospel*, or *Gospel-Ministry*, a *Boutefeu*, and

Abettor

*Abettor of Confusion and Disorder, an Invader
of Propriety, an Atheist, or whatever else of
ill Language is cast upon precious Men in
our days; I shall definire the Reader care-
fully to mind what is said by the Examiner,
and what by by the Party examined, and
see how far the Discourse may be accom-
modated, to the disagreeing Parties amongst
us. He was examined in the Year 1407.
under K. Henry the Fourth: He was brought
before Thomas Arundell, Arch-Bishop of Can- p. 527.
terbury, and Chancellor then of England.
In whose Examination, Mr. Fox tells his
good Reader, That he shall have both to Learn
and to Marvel: To Learn, in that he should
bear **Truth** discoursed and discussed, with the
contrary Reasons of the Adversary dissolved: To
Marvel, for that he should behold here in this
Man the marvellous force and strength of the
Lord's Might, Spirit and Grace, working and
Fighting in his Soldiers, and also speaking in
their Mouths, according to the Word of his
Promise, Luke 21.*

*The Examination of that good Man, and
blessed Servant of God, Mr. William
Thorpe, a Martyr in the days of K.
Henry the fourth, Anno Dom. 1407.
concerning Tithes, and the Mainte-
nance of a Gospel-Ministry; as it is
recorded by Mr. Fox in his Acts and
Monuments, p. 536, 537.*

And the Arch-Bishop then spake to me
all angelly, What sayest thou to this
fourth point that is certified against thee,
Preaching openly and boldly in Shrewsbury,
that Priests have no title to *Tithes*?
O And I said, Sir, I named there no
word of *Tithes* in my Preaching. But more
than a Month after that I was arrested, there
imprison a Man came to me, into the Pri-
son, asking me what I said of *Tithes*? And
I said to him, Sir, in this Town are many
Clerks and Priests, of which some are called
Religious Men, though many of them be
Seculars. Therefore ask ye of them this
Question: And the Man said to me, Sir,
our Prelates say, that we also are obliged
to pay our *Tithes* of all things that renew
to us: And that they are accursed that
withdraw any part wittingly from them of
their *Tithes*. And I said, Sir, to that Man,
as with my Protestation, I say now before
you, That I wonder that any Priest dare say
Men to be accursed, without the ground
of

of God's Word. And the Man said, Sir, our Priests say, that they Curse Men thus by Authority of God's Law. And I said, Sir, I know not where this Sentence of Cursing is Authorized now in the Bible; and therefore, Sir, I pray you, that ye will ask the most cunning Clerk of this Town, that ye may know where this Sentence of Cursing them that *Tithe* not, is now writ in God's Law: For if it were written there, I would right gladly be learned where. But shortly this Man would not go from me, to ask this Question of another Body, but required me there, as I would answer before God, if in this case, that Cursing of Priests were lawful and approved of God? And shortly herewith came to my mind the learning of St. Peter, teaching Priests specially to hallow the Lord Christ in their Hearts: Being evermore ready (as far as in them is) to answer thorough Faith and Hope to them that ask of them a Reason. And this lesson Peter teacheth Men to use with a meek Spirit, and with dread of the Lord. Wherefore, Sir, I said to this Man, in this wise, In the Old Law, which ended not fully till the time that Christ rose up again from Death to Life, God commanded *Tithe*s to be given to the *Levites*, for the great Business and daily Travel that pertained, to their Office. But Priests, because their Travel was much more easie and light, than was the Office of the *Levites*, God ordained the Priest should take for their livelihood

livelihood to do their Office, the tenth part of those *Tithes* that were given to the *Levites*: But now (I said) in the New Law, neither Christ nor any of his Apostles took *Tithes* of the People, nor commanded the People to pay *Tithes*, neither to Priests nor Deacons. But Christ taught the People to do Alms, that is, works of Mercy, to poor needy Men (of Surplus, that is superfluous, of their Temporal Goods) which they had, more than them needed reasonably to their necessary livelihood. And thus (I said) not of *Tithes*, but of pure Alms of the People, Christ lived, and his Apostles; when they were so busie in preaching of the Word of God to the People, that they might not Travel otherwise for to get their livelihood. But after Christ's Ascension, and when the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost; they travelled with their Hands, for to get their livelihood, when that they might thus do for busie-Preaching. Therefore by example of himself, St. Paul teacheth all the Priests of Christ for to Travel with their Hands, when for busie-Teaching of the People they might thus do. And thus, all those Priests whose Priesthood God accepteth now, or will accept, or did in the Apostles time, and after their Decease will do to the World's End. But (as *Cisterciensia* tellet) in the Thousand Year of our Lord Jesus Christ, 211. Year, one Pope the 10. *Gregory*, ordained new *Tithes* first to be given to Priests now in the New Law.

But

But St. *Paul* in his time, whose Trace or Example all Priests of God enforce them to follow, seeing the Covetousness that was among the People, desiring to destroy that foul Sin through the Grace of God and true Vertuous Living, and Example of himself! Wrote and Taught all Priests for to follow him, as he followed Christ, Patiently, Willingly, and Gladly, in high Poverty: Wherefore, *Paul* saith thus, The Lord hath ordained that they that Preach the Gospel, shall live of the Gospel. But we (saith *Paul*) that covet and busie us to be Faithful Followers of Christ, use not this Power. For lo (as *Paul* witnesseth afterwards) when he was full poor and needy, Preaching among the People, he was not chargeous unto them, but with his Hands he travelled, not only to get his own Living, but also the living of other poor and needy Creatures. And since People was never so Covetous, nor so Avarous (I guess) as they are now, it were good Counsel that all Priests took heed to this Heavenly Learning of *Paul*, following him here in wilful Poverty, nothing charging the People for their bodily livelihood. But because that many Priests do contrary to *Paul* in this aforesaid Doctrine: *Paul* biddeth the People take heed to those Priests that follow him, as he had given them Example. As if *Paul* would say thus to the People: Accept ye none other Priests than they, that live after the form that I have taught you.

N

For

For certain, in whatsoeuer Dignity or Order that any Priest is in, if he conform him not to follow Christ and his Apostles in wilful Poverty, and in other Heauenly Vertues, and specially in true Preaching of God's Word; though such a one be named a Priest, yet he is no more but a Priest in name, for the work of every Priest in such a one wanteth. This sentence approveth *Augustine, Gregory, Chrysostom and Limcoln,* plainly.

¶ And the Arch-Bishop said to me, Thinkest thou this wholesome Learning for to sow openly, or yet privily among the People? Certain, this Doctrine contrarieth plainly the Ordinance of Holy Fathers, which have ordained, granted and licensed Priests to be in divers Degrees, and to live by *Tithes* and Offerings of the People, and by other Duties.

¶ And I said, Sir, if Priests were now in measurable measure and number, and lived Vertuously, and taught busily and truly the Word of God, by Example of Christ, and of his Apostles, without *Tithes, Offerings and other Duties*, that Priests now challenge and take: The People would give them freely sufficient livelyhood.

And a Clark said to me, How wilt thou make this good, that the People will give freely to Priests their livelyhood: Since that now by the Law every Priest can scarcely constrain the People to give them their livelyhood.

¶ And

And I said, Sir, it is now no wonder tho' the People grudge to give Priests the lively-hood that they ask: Mekel People know now, how the Priests should live, and how that they live contrary to Christ and to his Apostles. And therefore the People is full heavy to pay (as they do) their Temporal Goods to Parsons, and to other Vicars and Priests, which should be faithful Dispensators of the Parishes Goods: Taking to themselves no more, but a scarce Living of *Tithes*, nor of Offerings, by the Ordinance of the common Law: For, whatsoever Priests take of the People (be it *Tithe* or Offering, or any other Duty or Service) the Priests ought not to have thereof no more, but a bare living; and to depart the residue to the poor Men and Women, especially of the Parish of whom they take this Temporal Living. But the most deal of Priests now wasteth their Parishes Goods, and spendeth them at their own will after the World, in their vain Lusts: So that in few places poor Men have duly (as they should have) their own sustenance, neither of *Tithes*, nor of Offerings, nor of other large Wages and Foundations, that Priests take of the People in divers manners above that they need for needful Sustenance of Meat and Clothing. But the poor needy People are forsaken and left of Priests, to be sustained of the Parishioners, as if the Priests took nothing of Parishioners for to help the People with.

And thus, Sir, into over-great Charges of the Parishioners they pay their Temporal Goods twice, where once might suffice, if Priests were true Dispensators: Also, Sir, the Parishioners that pay their Temporal Goods (be they Tithes or Offerings) to Priests that do not their Office among them justly, are partners of every Sin of those Priests, because that they sustain those Priests Folly in their Sin, with their Temporal Goods. If these things be well considered, what wonder is it then, Sir, if the Parishioners grudge against these Dispensators.

Then the Arch-Bishop said to me, Thou that shouldest be judged and ruled by Holy Church, presumptuously thou deemest Holy Church to have erred in the Ordinance of *Tithes*, and other Duties to be paid to Priests. It shall be long or thou thrive, Losel, that thou despisest thy Ghostly Mother. How darest thou speak this (Losel) among the People? Are not *Tithes* given to Priests for to live by?

¶ And I said, Sir, St. Paul saith, That *Tithes* were given in the old Law to Levites and to Priests, that came of the Lineage of *Levi*. But our Priests, he saith, came not of the Lineage of *Levi*, but of the Lineage of *Judah*, to which *Judah* no *Tithes* were promised to be given. And therefore Paul saith, Since the Priesthood is changed from the Generation of *Levi*, to the Generation of *Judah*: It is necessary that changing also be

be made of the Law. So that Priests live now, without *Tithes* and other Duty that they now claim, following Christ and his Apostles, in willful Poverty, as they have given them Example. For since Christ lived (all the time of his Preaching) by pure Alms of the People. And by Example of him, his Apostles lived in the same wise, or else by the Travel of their Hands, as it is said above. Every Priest, whose Priesthood Christ approveth, knoweth well, and confesseth in Word, and in Work, that a Disciple ought not to be above his Master, but it sufficeth to a Disciple to be as his Master, Simple and Pure, Meek and Patient: And by Example specially of his Master Christ, every Priest should rule him in all his living, and so after his cunning and power, a Priest should busie him to enform and to rule, whomsoever he might charitably.

And the Arch-Bishop said to me with a great Spirit, God's Curse have thou, and mine, for this Teaching: For thou wouldest hereby make the Old Law more free and perfect than the New Law. For thou sayst, that it is lawful to Levites and to Priests to take Tithes in the Old Law, and so to enjoy their Priviledges: But to us Priests in the New Law, thou sayst, it is not lawful to take Tithes. And thus thou givest Levites of the Old Law, more freedom than to Priests of the New Law.

And I said, Sir, I marvel that ye understand this plain Text of *Paul* thus. Ye wot well, that the Levites and Priests in the Old Law that took Tithes, were not so free nor so perfect, as Christ and his Apostles that took no Tithes. And, Sir, there is a Doctor (I think that it is St. *Jerom*) that saith thus: The Priests that challenge now in the New Law Tithes, say in effect that Christ is not become Man, nor that he hath yet suffered Death for Man's Love. Wherefore, this Doctor saith this Sentence, Since Tithes were the Hires and Wages limited to Levites and to Priests, of the Old Law, for bearing about of the Tabernacle, and for Slaying and Fleying of Beasts, and for burning of Sacrifice, and for keeping of the Temple, and for tromping of Battle before the Host of *Israel*, and other divers Observances that pertained to their Office: Those Priests that will challenge to take Tithes, deny that Christ is come in the Flesh, and do the Priests Office of the Old Law, for whom Tithes were granted: Por else (as this Doctor saith) Priests take now Tithes wrongfully.

And the Arch-Bishop said to his Clerks, Heard ye ever Losel speak thus? Certain this is the Learning of them all, that wherefover they come, they may be suffered: They enforce them to expugn the freedom of Holy Church.

And

And I said, Sir, why call you the taking of Tithes, and of such other Duties that Priests challenge now (wrongfully) the freedom of Holy Church? Since neither Christ nor his Apostles, challenge nor took such Duties. Herefore these takings of Priests now are not called justly the freedom of Holy Church, but all such giving and taking ought to be called and holden, the slanderous Covetousness of Men of the Holy Church.

And the Arch-Bishop said to me, Why Losel, wilt not thou, and others that are confedered with thee, seek out of Holy Scripture and of the Sense of Doctors, all sharp Authorities against Lords, Knights and Squires, and against other secular Men, as thou doest against Priests?

And I said, Sir, whatsoever Men or Women, Lords or Ladies, or any other that are present in our Preaching specially, or in our communing after our cuning, we tell out to them their Office and other Charges. But, Sir, since Chrysostome saith, that Priests are the Stomach of the People, it is needful in Preaching, and also in Communing, to be most busie about this Priesthood, since by the Viciousness of Priests, both Lords and Commons are most Sinfully infected, and led into the Worst. And because that the Covetousness of Priests, and Pride, and the boast that they have and make of their Dignity and Power, destroyeth not only the Vertues of Priesthood

in Priests themselves, but also over this, it stirreth God to take great Vengeance both upon the Lords, and upon Commons, which suffer these Priests charitably.

And the Arch-Bishop said to me, Thou judgest every Priest Proud that will not go arrayed as thou doest. By God I deem him to be more meek, that goeth every day in a Scarlet Gown, than thou in thy thread-bear Blew Gown. Whereby knowest thou a proud Man?

¶ And I said, Sir, a proud Priest may be known, when he deemeth to follow Christ and his Apostles in wilful Poverty and other Vertues; and coveteth worldly Worship, and taketh it gladly, and gathereth together with Pleding, Menacing, or with Flattering, or with Simony, any worldly Goods: And most, if a Priest busie him not chiefly in himself, and after in all other Men and Women after his Cunning and Power, to withstand Sin.

And the Arch-Bishop said to me, Tho' thou knewest a Priest to have all these Vices, and tho' thou sawest a Priest lovely lye now by a Woman, knowing her Fleshly; Wouldest thou therefore deem this Priest damnable? I say to thee that in the turning about of thy Hand, such a Sinner may be verily repented.

¶ And I said, Sir, I will not Damn any Man for any Sin that I know done, or may be done, so that the Sinner leaveth his Sin. But by authority of Holy Scripture, he that Sinneth

Sinneth thus openly, as ye shew here, is
damnable for doing of such a Sin: And
most specially, a Priest that should be Exam-
ple to all other for to hate and fly Sin. And
in how short time that ever ye say that such
a Sinner may be repented; he ought not
of him that knoweth his Sinning, to be
judged verily Repentant, without open-evi-
dence of great Shame, and hearty Sorrow
for his Sin. For whosoever (and specially
a Priest) that useth Pride, Envy, Cov-
etousness, Lechery, Simony, or any other
Vices; and sheweth not as open evidence of
Repentance, as he hath given evil Example
and occasion of Sinning, if he continue in
any such Sin as long as he may; it is likely
that Sin leaveth him, and he not Sin: And
as I understand such a one Sinneth unto
Death, for whom no Body oweth to pray,
as St. John saith.

And a Clark said then to the Arch-Bishop,
Sir, the longer that ye oppose him, the
worse he is: And the more ye busie to a-
mend him, the waywarder he is For he
is of so shrewd a kind, that he shameth not
only to be himself a foul Nest, but with-
out shame he busieth him to make his Nest
fouler.

The Judgment of the Learned David Parcens, a Reformed Divine of Heidelberg, in the Palatinate (where Ministers have no Tithes) concerning Tithes.

David Parcens, in his Commentary upon *Genes. 28. 22.* where *Jacob*, after God had appeared to him in a Dream at *Bethel*, vowed unto the Lord the Tenth of that Substance which the Lord should give him: He thereupon makes this ensuing Discourse about Tithes, whether they are due under the New Testament:

' Tithes or Tenths were free and arbitrary before the Law, as appears by the Example of *Abraham* and *Jacob*; a Man might give them, a Man might vow them, or he might not, as he pleased. Under the Law they were commanded by God to be given to the Priests, *Levit. 27.* And the Reasons thereof are clear: First, The Tenth were a Compensation unto the *Levites*, for the Twelfth part of the Land, which ought to have fallen otherwise to their share. Moreover, they were the Salaries of the Priests and Levites, and Maintenance of the Poor. For God instituted three Tents; first, the Tents of the *Levites*, *Levit. 27.* Secondly, The Tents of Tents, or the Hundreths, to be payed by the *Levites* to the Priests, *Num. 18. 26.* Thirdly, the Poor Man's

• Man's Tenth, which was to be paid every
• third Year, after the Jubilee, unto the Poor,
• Strangers, Widows, Orphans. *Deut.* 14.
• 28. The Tithes were therefore of old
• due by Divine Right. Hence our Clergy-
• Men infer, If they were so of old, then are
• they so now. But it doth not follow:
• I answer, therefore first, that the Clergy
• of old had a Divine Ceremonial, not a Di-
• vine Moral Right of Constitution, *Num.* 18.
• 27, 28. That Right is now ceased, there-
• fore the now Clergy cannot claim Tithes
• by virtue of such a Right. Secondly,
• there is a great difference betwixt our
• Clergy and the Jewish; they were appoint-
• ed by God to Sacrifice, ours are not so;
• they had Tithes as a Compensation of that
• Lot which they should otherwise have in
• the Land; ours have them not upon such
• an account; they had no Lands nor Pos-
• sessions, besides the Tithes; ours have
• Towns, Villages, Mannors, yea, Coun-
• tries and Provinces; nor is there any end
• of their unfeaturable Covetousness, devour-
• ing the Houses of Widows and Orphans
• under the pretence of Massing and Pray-
• ing, *Mat.* 23. Therefore when the *Judaical*
• Priesthood did cease, then did the Right
• of that Priesthood cease; and the Right of
• Tithes did revert to God, as Governour
• and Sovereign of the World. And this
• Right did God, under the *Judaical Polity*,
• befallow upon the King, *i Sam.* 8. And
• Paul ascribes the Right of publick Cu-
• stoms,

‘*Alms, Taxes and Tributes unto the ^{supreme} Magistrate*, Rom. 13. If therefore Emperors, Kings and Christian Potentates have bestowed upon any Churches the Tents for the Maintenance of the *Clergy*, then it is not by any Divine, but Humane Right, that the said *Clergy* do receive Tithes. And therefore, if the said *Clergy* do not discharge their Duty, in teaching the *Churches* under them, but degenerate into idle and wanton Persons, as we see now-a-days; then, even by the Laws of Man, do they lose all Right to Tithes, and they may revert to the Magistrate. For when the Office ceaseth, the Benefit also ceaseth: And he deserves to lose his Priviledges, who doth misuse the Power that is granted him. 11. quæst. 3. c. *Privilegium.*

The same *Paræus*, in his Commentary upon the Thirteenth of the *Romans*, where he debates the *Pope's Supremacy in Temporals*, brings in, as an Objection for his Paramount Dignity and Superiority, That he who receives Tithes is superior to him that gives them: But the Pope receives Tithes. It is from this Objection observable, how prejudical the paying of Tithes (if continued) may prove to a State, in order to a subverting of the *Magistracy*. But *Paræus's* answer is, ‘That the Major is false, if it be taken Universally. For in the Old Testament some Tithes were paid to the poor, and inferiour sort. For there were then three sorts of Tithes. 1st. The common Tithe, which was paid to the

c. Leviticus

Levites, as a Compensation for the twelfth part of the Land, which they should otherwise have possessed ; of these, see *Levit. 27. 30. 2dly.* The *Tithe of Tithes*, which the *Levites* payed out of their *Tenths* unto the *Priests*, for their *Ministry*; of which, see *Num. 18. 26. 3dly.* The *Poor Man's Tithe*, which was payed every third Year, after the *Sabbatical Year*; not only to the *Levites*, but were common to them with the *Poor, Widows, Orphans, and Strangers*; of which you may read *Deut. 14. 28.* The *Rich* gave to the *Poor, Superiors* to *Inferiors*, not thereby to recognize their *Power*, but to recompence their *Service*, or for an *Alms*. Therefore the *Major* is not universally true, That he who receives *Tithes*, is greater than he that gives : [though it be true, when *Melchizedec* receives *Tithes*, as well as *blesseth*.] But farther, omitting or supposing the *Major*, which the *Apostle* seems to suppose as granted, *Heb. 7. 5.* saying, That *Melchizedec in his Priesthood was greater than Aaron, because he received Tithes of Abraham*. I answere (saith *Patens*) That the Syllogism hath four Terms in it. And the *Major* is true respecting *Tithes*, properly so called, and such as were due by the *Divine Ceremonial Laws*. And the *Minor* only true, as to *Tithes*, improperly so called, such as are of *Humane Appointment*, as a *Stipend, Salary, or Reward*, and not by Constitution of the *Divine Ceremonial Law*.

Law. For Tuber, properly so called, as
 the First-fruits by the Ceremonial Law,
 were due to God, who resigned his
 Right over to the Levites, and they did
 typifie Christ, whom the ancient Jews, by
 paying their First-fruits and Tithes, did
 worship and acknowledge as the future
 Messiah. For they were a part of the Le-
 vitical Oblations, as is manifest, Num. 18.
 27, 28. But after the appearance of Christ,
 the Levitical Laws and Olations ceased;
 and consequently so did the First-fruits
 and Tithes, properly so called. As for
 the Tithes which were afterwards continu-
 ed by the Law of Nations, they were
 partly granted by the Liberality of Em-
 perors and Kings, unto the Clergy and
 Churches; yet not as Tithes, but as Salaries
 in Ordinary; not by vertue of any
 Ceremonial Law, but by the Moral Law,
 or Law of Nations, whereby Stipends are
 due to the Ministers of the Church; For
 the Labourer is worthy of his Hire; and by
 positive Constitutions, whereby this or
 that Stipend became their due. In some
 places therefore Pastors have, by Humane
 Prescription, the Sixieths and Thirtieths, no
 less than Tithes. In some places they
 have Lands and Fields; in some places
 Money, or a determinate quantity of Corn;
 as a just Recompence for their Perfor-
 mances. Now from hence no Superiority
 of Power can be infer'd, because a sa-
 tisfaction for pains taken is due, and is
 payed

payed as well to Inferiours as Superiours,
and by them: For as the *Magistrates* re-
ceive from the People Tributes, Taxes, and
Tenbs., whereby to maintain their Estates,
and uphold the Common-Wealth; so also
they obliged to sustain the Ministers of
State and Church with competent Sal-
aries, whether in *Tithes*, *Lands*, or Other
Revenue.

XXX. Whether they had the use of Bells in the
primitive Times? And whether the Bells in
England, that remain ever since the Reforma-
tion, have not been Popishly and Superstitiously
Chriftened?

That the first Christians had no *Bells*, is
proved by *Koffus* in his Commentary upon
the two Epistles of *Pliny*, and *Trajan*, and
Bernardinus de ritu concionandi. *Guido Panciro-
lus* saith, they were invented by one *Pagli-
nus* Bishop of *Nola*: And that they were
called *Nola* in Latine, from *Nola* the place
where they were first made; and *Campane*,
because invented in *Campania*. *Hospinian de
orig. temp.* saith, They were not used for
certain in the first five Centuries almost of
Christianity, when yet their Parishes, or
Church Precincts, were of a greater extent
than the most diffused amongst us. As
for their Baptizing of *Bells* amongst the
Papists, the several Ceremonies, their nam-
ing them (and providing them *God-fa-
thers*) with much more solemnity than
they Baptise; hercuf you may be infor-
med

ined by Hospinian de orig. templ. l. 4. c. 9.

b XXXI. Whether it were not an act of Superstition, in former times, to build Churches and Chappels in the form or fashion of a Croſs? Whether it were not a Sin of the like nature, in ancient times, to build their Churches East and West, that so the People might Bow and Pray towards the East, whence they expected the Son [of Righteousness] ſhould arife? And whether both theſe Superſtitioſes have not been renewed and practiſed lately in one of the Reformed Colledges of Oxford?

*Brazen-nose
Colledge.*

XXXII. Whether the primitive Christians had any Universities, or other Schools of Learning, than ſuch as Origen did Catechize in at Alexandria? (*)

*part 2.8.26.
p. 89. 90.
de grad. mi-
nistr. c. 26.*

(*) Gaudentius de mor. ſecul. Justinian. faith, 'We do not read that ever the Ancients did openly, and in Schools teach Philosophy, ſince they did rather abhor it. — I would fain ſee any Man that could ſhew that the Christians, either before or in the time of Justinian, did openly teach Philosophy. And Hadrian Saravia informs us how the Primitive Christians, though they had not Academical Schools, like to thoſe we have now a-days, yet it is evident that they were not altogether destitute of Schools, for they had one at Alexandria, which produced before Origen, Pantænus and Clemens Alexandrinus. But these

these were but Schools in which they read Catechistical Lectures: Nor indeed have I ever heard of an University of the *Albigenses*, or *Waldenses* and *Bohemians*.

XXXIII. Whether *Ancient Times* (and those not very Ancient neither) Record any more than that of Bologna, Paris, Oxford and Salamanca? And whether Christianity at that time were not of farther extent, than the Kingdoms those stood in?

XXXIV. Whether it were not the design of the Reformers, in King Edward the sixth's days, to put down Universities? (a) Whether the then Dean of Christ-Church (b) had not intentions to reduce Oxford to one or very few Colledges?

(a) Doctor *Langbain* in his Peface to Sr. *John Cheek's* Book, *The Subject to the Rebel*, hath these words: 'The very Universities, which had been the Glory, were now become the Scorn or Pity of the Kingdom; their Libraries robbed and spoiled, either by pretended Authority or Connivance, their Liberties and Priviledges invaded, and born down by the prevailing Parties, the Townsmen of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*. Much of their present Maintenance, and the main hopes of their future Preferment, taken from them; at least in their Opinion: When they saw most or all their Revenues of their Colledges given to the King.

King. Some Bishopricks actually dissolved, and the whole Jurisdiction inclining to Ruin. This did strike them with such a Panick Fear, as did justly deter Parents from bestowing upon their Children, that ingenuous Education which was attended with so great Charges, and so small hopes; and such as were already entered upon that way, were forced to quit their Professions, and betake themselves to another kind of Life.

A little after, he having shewed out of John Bale a great Antiquary, and an Enemy to Monckery and Popery, how the Anabaptists in Germany did not more destroy Libraries, than the English Reformers and their Adherents, adds, The very sight of those Barbarous Infelicities, committed upon those Treasuries of good Letters, Books and Libraries, could not but impress in serious Apprehensions, a deep sense of the approaching Funerals of most kinds of Learning, and make them take their long leaves of the University, and so they did: In so much that at Oxford, their publick Schools were converted into a private Garden-plot; their publick Treasury Robbed; their Moneys and Muniments imbesel'd and wasted away, as does more largely appear by the Preface to a Royal Grant of Q. Mary's to that University, in the first of her Reign.

The

UMI

gisted. Yet was that fact attributed to Richard Cox, and Posterity hath imputed it to the Dean of Christ-Church under Edward the sixth, and stiled him the Robber [prædonem] of Oxford-Library; I know not how justly, but sure I am, it was a performance not unbecoming him, who had resolved by uniting several Colledges together, to overthrow the Colledge-Foundations, and entire frame [totam Oeconomiam] of Oxford; as is manifest out of the Archives of the University.

Dr. Langbain in the Preface already mentioned, saith, that under Edward the sixth, There was an ample Commission granted to the Earl of Warwick, and Eight more, any Seven, Six, Five, Four, Three, Two, or One of Them, to visit, *in capite & membris*, the whole Diocels of Oxford, but especially the University of Oxford. What other effects that Visitation had, does not well appear, but ('tis said) Richard Cox [who was an understanding and zealous Person, Tutor to K. Edward] ' who was one of them, did so clearly purge the University-Library of all Monuments of Superstition, that he left not one Book in it of all those goodly Manuscripts— with which it was amply furnished.

XXXV. Whether the rise of our present fashioned Universities, and University-Habits, was not from Dominicans; an Order instituted by the Pope to suppress

' To the Queen to all unto whom these presents
 ' Letters shall come, Greeting. We have been ^{Mark who} informed by several ^{upheld Uni-}
 ' Witsnesses, and it hath been ^{versities, and} evidently represented unto us by certain Proofs, ^{for what} reason.
 ' that our University of Oxford, which is, as it
 ' were, the one Eye of the Nation, and hath been
 ' formerly the Seat of good Learning, hath been
 ' so injured by the Times, that it is almost de-
 ' solate, and extinct in its Repute: That the
 ' Schools, in which they used to Meet and Di-
 ' spute, are laid waste, and turned into Gardens;
 ' the publick Treasury Rifled, the publick Orna-
 ' ments Defaced, Revenues impaired, so as they
 ' are reduced to almost nothing. We therefore
 ' thinking it to appertain to our Royal Duty to
 ' establish that almost ruined place, and re-erect
 ' the Schools, that it may subsist, as we hope,
 ' for ever, as without which neither can the
 ' Orthodox [that is Popish] Religion be de-
 ' fended, nor Controversies according to Truth de-
 ' termined, nor Justice duly administered in the
 ' Common-Wealth, &c. And (adds Dr. Lang-
 ' bain) though this might persuade with
 ' some, that to be a Scholar was none of
 ' the greatest Curses: Yet I do not see that
 ' the People were heartily friends with Learn-
 ' ing all Q. Mary's days, nor in the begin-
 ' ning of Q. Elizabeth.

(b) Brian Twyne in his Appendix to what he had written about the Antiquity of the University of Oxford, saith, that ' The publick Library there did Flourish for many Years, until that it was dissolved by some, whose names unto Posterity none hath registered.

O 2

gisted.

UMI

suppress the Waldenses, whose Predecessors of the Protestants? Whether this be the Spot or Attire of God's Children? And whether they have not the Spirit, as well as Garb, of Persecutors, and the Man of Sin?

XXXVI. Whether the Institution of Doctoral Degrees be not Novel? (a) And accounted Antichristian by the Reformed Churches in Scotland, France, Holland, Switzerland, and the Calvinist in High-Germany? And whether they have any in those Countries (b)? Or any constant peculiar Habits in their Universities (c)?

(a) Gaudent. de mor. sœc. Justin. ^{c. 24. p. 87,} Did ^{88.} they in the time of Justinian create any Doctors, who had finished their Studies, and their time of being Masters? Was this their Custom? There is no Ground for any Man to think so: For that was an Invention of later Years, not of those Ancient Times. When Learning began to be restored again, about 300 Years ago, then the Name and Title of Doctor began to be conferred solemnly.

(b) The Degree of Doctor of Divinity, as it is conferred upon one who resides in an University, and Preacheth or Disputeth occasionally, and as it is made up of nothing but an having performed (or not performed, but procured a Dispensation for) such and such Exercises after the staying

O 3 (or

(or buying) of

What I say here doth not prejudice the deduction of our *Doctors* (and *Ministry ordained by imposition of bands*) from the *Jewish Rabbines*: Of which see *J. Scaliger. Elench Tribarum. c. 10.* And since *Rabbi* was the title given at *Jewish Promotions*, I am apt to think that such Degrees were absolutely condemned, *Matth. 23. v, 8, 9.*

so much Time, With the expence of so much Money, and the discharge of several Ridiculous Solemnities, together with the constant wearing of a *Cowl*, and some other *Vestments*, fetched out of a Popish Wardrobe: This,

as I remember very well to have read somewhere, and sundry Foreign Divines have told me, is by the Reformed Churches esteemed of as Antichristian. Sure I am, that I never heard, nor read of any such Degree collated amongst them, nor do they admit of any but such as are *Professors of Divinity*; so *Beza* was Pastor and Doctor at *Geneva*. The Degree is as Popish as the Divinity whereto it refers; A Divinity erected in 1220, and which is acknowledged to have been the subversion of Christianity. A Doctor that is no Teacher, he

Hospinian
de orig. tem.
pl. 1. 3. c. 3. is a dumb Dog, an insignificant piece of Formality in the University, reserved by the Reformers (as it were) upon such ground as *Constantine* in the demolishing of Statues, preserved some *Heathen Idols*, that Posterity might know what Beasts their Fathers had worshipped. The *Genevians* in their Annotations upon the Ninth of the *Revelations*, vers. 3. where the *Locusts* came out of the Smoak, saith, They were and are False Teachers, Hereticks, and worldly subtle Prelates, with Monks, Friars, Cardinals, Patriarchs,

Archs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Doctors, Batchelors and Masters.

Does not this Note apparently fasten the name of *Locusts* upon the Clergy of this Land, and all such as are Graduated in the University, by the name of *Doctors, Batchelors and Masters?* And doth it not as plainly York them with *Friars, Monks and Cardinals*, principal Instruments in all times to advance *Papedom?* I know the words which follow after, are alledged by some, to take off the Envy of this Note, *viz.* *Who forsake Christ to maintain false Doctrines.* But the enumeration of so many particulars, makes not that Note the less invidious, the said Explication notwithstanding; because the Note had been as perfect and significant, had it gone thus in general only, that is to say, by *Locusts* here are meant *false Teachers, Hereticks, and other worldly subtle Men*, that seduced the People, persuading them to forsake Christ to maintain *false Doctrines*: Dr. Heylin against Fuller's History, p. 179, 180.

(c) As for *Habits*; that they have some Particularities, at the time of *Academical Promotions*, I shall not deny, no not in Scotland; but the constant wear of them at Solemnities (for at other times there is not a different Habit between Scholars and others) I am not informed of. *Didotlavis*, the famous Scotch Presbyter, in his Book, called,

Altare Damascenum, p. 891. Speaking of Clerical Habits, saith, ‘ That Hoods, Tippers; and square Caps [*Epitogia, Liripipia, pilei quadrati, bardocuculi & id genus aliae vestes*] were introduced by Antichrist, to promote his Splendor. It is an Histrioical or Stage-Play Dress, and altogether Ridiculous ; being a distinguishing of some Men from others, by signs useless, and destitute of all Ornament. Upon their Shoulders hangs down an Hood, such as Fools sometimes wear, being neither handsome nor convenient. Bucer refused to wear a Square Cap ; and being demanded the Reason, he replied, That Nature had made his Head round ; as Pilkington relates it in his Letter to the Earl of Leicester. Philpot chose rather to be secluded the Convocation of the Clergy, than to wear an Hood and Tippet : As Fox tells us in his *Acts and Monuments*.

XXXVII. Whether there are not in our, as well as other Antichristian Universities beyond Sea, the same, or rather more Popish, Idolatrous and Superstitious Habits, Ceremonies and Customs ? Nay, whether they do not exceed them in Pomp, as well as Number ?

Here I am ready to cry out, Come and see ! Come and see ! Not John the Baptist, in the Wilderness ; not John the Divine in Patmos ; but our Theologues, in their Pontificals at Oxon. View their Habits, their Ceremonies, their Processions, the respects due

to

to them by Statute, and you will find that Petition from the Well-affected in Oxon, was not groundless, which desired the abrogation of them, since they served to create a pride in them, who ought to be all meekness; and so render them Averse from going to preach, or *Scandalous* in the discharge thereof. *Come and see the Scarlet Whore, re-<sup>Ornatiss. ac
fordes, per
modo fugi-
endis sunt;
quia alter-
rum delic-
us, alterum re-
dolet. He-
ren. ad Mi-</sup>*
presented in a Glass, multiplying Doctors: *Come and see the difference betwixt Presbytery & Popery, since they apply that expression to Democracy so often, let me stile them in comparison of the Romish Antichrist, the more many-headed Beast: If the other strive to make the Kings of the Earth drunk with the Cup of Fornications, these catch at Crowns and Half-Crowns. As for the Lost Sheep of Israel, the poor and the weak whom God hath chosen, unless the Salary be good, they seem to be under as great a Prohibition from preaching to them, as the Apostle was from going into Bitynia, Acts 16.7.*

XXXVIII. Whether the University-Hood be not the product of the Old Monkish Melote, spoken of by Cassian de institutione Monachorum; and grounded upon the Superstitions Exposition of that place in Heb. 11. They wandered about in *μανταις*, in Sheep-skins? Whether it were not a Religious Habit, it being a Badge of Monks, according to Cassian and Jerom, upon Pachomius's Rule?

XXXIX. Whether it be not a Superstitious and Detestable Exposition of that Scripture, Stand fast, having your Loyns girt, &c. To accommodate it to the Episcoparian Girdles, with which they tie in their Canonical Coats?

XL. Whether it be not a pretty Foundation for the Oxford-Doctors to stand Roated and Spurred in the Act; (a) Because there is mention made in the Scripture of being shod with the preparation of the Gospel?

(a) See statut. Acad. Oxon. Tit. 7. sect. paragr. 17.

XLI. Whether the University of Oxford do well to give for their Arms the Book with seven Seals? Is not that a gross Abuse of what is laid down in the Revelations; as if the seven Liberal Arts, (two whereof are Grammar and Riddling) were typified by those Seals which none were worthy to open but the Lamb?

XLII. Whether Ministers do well to go in Black, or the Universities to command it.
 (a) See Statut. Acad. Oxon. Tit. 14. paragr. 1. The words of the Statutes are in English thus: It is Ordered, That all Heads of Colledges, all Fellows and Scholars wear Black, or Sad-coloured Clothes, and all that are initiated into Holy Orders, as it becomes those of the Clergy to do. Clemens Alexandrinus expressly condemns all Coloured Clothes, and makes it the Command or Doctrine of the great Christian School-Master [Christ] to go in White,

White, as any one may read in his *Pedagog.*
I. 2. & I. 3. Μάρτυς ἐν τῷ πατέρι ὁ πατέρας ἡδόνης
Χρῆστος τῇ αὐτῇ χρήσει τῇ τῇ καυκῆ.

* Didocratius, in his *Altare Damascenum*,
p. 888. observes, in opposition to the
Episcopal Garbs, that Paul ordains, That a
Bishop, or Minister, be *decorus* decently at-
tired, but not distinguished from other
Men, 1 Tim. 3. 2. He cannot find (p. 889.)
to what purpose they should affect a *singu-
lar Habit*, but to receive Salutations and
Addresses from the People in Assemblies,
as did the Pharisees, Mat. 23. 5, 6, 7. The
Apostles did not distinguish themselves in
their Attire from other Men, whether Be-
lievers or Unbelievers: They were known
by their *Speech*, and not their *Array*, to be
Galileans, Mat. 26. 73. These and much
more is laid by him against a *Singularity of
Dress*, in ordinary appearances.

XLIII. Whether there were not of old amongst
the Jews a sort of Men called Chemarims or
Black-coats? Whether those were the People of
God? (a) And whether the Translators of the <sup>They render
it Priests,</sup> Bible into English did well to conceal the true
meaning of this Word, by putting another for it,
or the very Word it self in English Letters?

Amongst the Jews, those Kings who busied
themselves to seduce the People unto, or
continue them in *Idolatry*, they contrived
a sort of *Idolatrous Priests*, 2 Kings 22. 5.
who were attired in *Black*, that they might,
by the speciousness of their *Habit*, and af-
fected

fected Gravity, become a Snare. These were prophesied against by *Hosea*, chap. 10. 5. though our Translators do not express the word *Cbemarim*, or *Black-coat*, in the Text, yet doth *Cbemarim* stand in the Margin. They were suppressed by *Josiah*, 2 Kings 23.5. And God, by *Zephaniah*, chap. 1. 4. saith, That he will stretch out his hand upon Judah, and upon all the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and cut off the Remnant of Baal, and the name of

*Vid. Fuller's
Holy Land,
in his Treas-
tise of Gar-
ments. c. 6.
And Bux-
torf in his
Lexicon in
loc.*

*Jerom bids
Nepotian,
being to en-
ter upon the
Clergy, to
avoid Black
Attire.*

Cbemarims, with the Priests. By destroying the name of *Cbemarims*, he shews his Wrath and Resentments against the Colour and Habit; for he doth not only threaten to Exterminate the Priests, the *Cobamim*, but even the Name of *Black-coat*, or *Cbemarim*, which must be effected by putting down the *Superstitions Habit* (as *Buxtorf* in his *Hebrew Lexicon* phraseth it) since he did not intend they should call Black White. The Jews at this day call the Monks *Cbemarims*, as our Ministers may be stiled likewise.

XLIV. Whether, in Tertullian's time, every one that did turn Christian, or at least was made a Presbyter, did not renounce his Gown (which was the Roman Vestment) for a long dark-coloured Cloke? Whether afterwards the Clergy and Laity did not relinquish that, for Coats (*Iacernæ*) and both were alike habited? In fine, was not one, a Bishop, condemned at the Council of Gangrae for introducing the Fashion of long-dark-coloured Cloaks, that were counted at that Assembly, *ἀνέρπισε τὴν ιορωμένην*. unbecoming the Priest-Hood?

All

All this is clear to any Man that shall read out *Tertullian de Pallio*, with the Notes of *Salmasius* thereon.

XLV. Whether the Doctors Scarlet Gowns were not at first instituted as an Emblem, or Representation of the Zeal, which they either had, or at least ought to have? (a) And whether those Doctors of Oxford and Cambridge, who wear Scarlet-Gowns, have not as little Zeal as those Doctors which wear none?

Erasmus encom. Moriae. ‘What! Doth not the Scarlet signifie a most ardent Love towards God?’

XLVI. Whether any of the Ceremonies and Habits, now used in the Universities, had a very good Original, or have been employed to a good use since?

XLVII. Whether those things that had a good Original and Use (if they be not still necessary, or commanded by God) when once they have been used unto Idolatry or Superstition, are not quite to be abolished?

’Tis much if it be not objected here by some, That though their Original were Popish and Antichristian; yet, since they are employed to better Ends and Uses, viz. For Distinction, Order and Decency, they may be lawfully enough retained. To this I shall answer, Might not the Jews have objected the same Reason to their Reformers, that the Golden-Calf and Groves might not

be

be consumed, and turned into Ashes, because they might be employed hereafter to better uses? The one for Exchange and Traffick, the other for Building, Fuel, or a pleasant Shade, very convenient in that hot Country? Might not the *Brazen-Serpent*, though it were worshipped by some, yet still be preserved; because it might serve to put others in mind of God, who had cured, as well as the Pots of *Manna*, which were laid up to remember them, how God had miraculously fed their Fathers in the *Wildernes*? Yet when the *Brazen-Serpent* was once abused to Idolatry, away it must go. In like manner, was not *Baali* a proper significant good Word? Yet when once an Idol was called by it, the Lord (who is a Jealous God) would have it no more used in his Worship and Service, but commanded them to call him *Ishi*.

Yet we do not find *That* true neither, *That they are employed for Distinction and Decency*, but rather in Pride, Pomp, vain Glory: So that by retaining of them, they do no more than the *Levite*, who stole away *Micha's gods* from *Mount Ephraim*, and set them up at *Dan*, where Idolatry became a more publick Worship. 'Tis true, that while the Army continued in Action, 'twas thought fit by the *University Men* in part to lay them aside, at least for a while; but since the honest party of the Armies have been scattered and weakned in great measure, they have again brought them into

into full Credit and Fashion ; just like the Jews, who had learn'd to make a *Calf* in Egypt, but had no opportunity to practice till *Moses* was gone out of the Camp.

XLVIII. Whether singing of David's Psalms be a part of Divine Worship? (a) Whether that practice was introduced in England for a Spiritual End, or only to preserve the Estimation and Knowledge of the laudable Science of Musick?

(a) The way of Singing Psalms, as it is ordinarily used in the Rithmical way, hath no foundation in the Customs of the Ancients. Beza (I think) being much diverted with Poetry, made his *Pastime* to become a part of the vulgar Devotion : Hence I have heard them stiled, by some Papists, Geneva Figgs. And indeed upon my most severe thoughts, to make the *Davidical Hymns* (though better translated) to be a part of our rational Service towards God, to sing in cases of Joy and Sorrow, or God's several dealings with us, what he did pen upon Emergencies, somewhat resembling, yet differenced by a number of Circumstances, is as absurd and ridiculous; as if (upon the like occasions) we should select Epistles or Orations out of *Tully*, and use them in common address to one another, or to the Parliament, who doubtless would not think it an act of respect, but mockage: If a Delinquent should, instead of an humble Petition, tender them a Paper entituled, The *Oration of Marcus Tullius*

Tullius Cicero, unto Julius Cæsar, in the behalf of Marcus Marcellus, or Ligarius; tho' the Preferer should avow it for an excellent Piece, made by the best of Orators, in a case somewhat Parallel; yet all he could effect would be, that as he was before sequestred for Malignancy, so he should continue still, either for Disrespects or Folly.

(b) These are the express words of the Injunctions given to the Clergy and Laity by ^{Injunctions. 49.} Q. Elizabeth. Item, Because in divers Collegiate, and also some Parish-Churches, heretofore there hath been Livings appointed for the Maintenance of Men and Children, to use Singing in the Church, by means whereof, the laudable Science of Musick hath been had in Estimation, and preserved in Knowledge; the Queen's Majesty neither meaning in any wise the decay of any thing that might conveniently tend to the use and continuance of the said Science, neither to have the same in any part so abused in the Church, that thereby the Common-Prayer should be the worse understanded of the Hearers, will eth and commandeth, that first no alteration be made of such assignments of Living, as heretofore hath been appointed to the use of Singing, or Musick in the Church, but that the same so remain. And that there be a modest and distinct Song so used in all parts of the Common-Prayers in the Church, that the same may be as plainly understanded, as if it were read without Singing; and yet nevertheless for the comforting of such as delight in Musick, it may be permitted,

that

that in the beginning, or in the end of Common-Prayers, either at Morning or Evening, there may be sung an Hymn, or such like Song, to the Praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of Melody and Musick that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the Hymn may be understood and perceived.

XLIX. Whether if the Supreme Magistrate should Enact or Ordain that the Names of Schismatick and Heretick should signify nothing of Infamy or Disgrace, but a plain Dissent and Separation: Or, that they should be totally disused amongst us, they have not for the former procedure the Warrant of Antiquity; and for the latter, the President of Q. Elizabeth, as well as Q. Mary?

Under the Jewish Polity, after the failure of the *Urim* and *Tummim*, when God ceased by extraordinary means, to give out his Oracles, and Manifestations of his Will, the several Sects amongst them were stiled by the common name of *Hereticks*, and their ways *Heresie*: As the *Sadduces*, Acts 5. 17. The *Pharisees*, Acts 15. 7. The *Christians*, Acts 24. 5. And this is that which Paul says, Acts 24. 14. *I confess unto you, after the way which they call Heresie, do I serve my God.* Ομολογῶ δὲ τὴν τρόπον, ὅτι κατὰ τὸν θεόν πάντα λατρεύω τῷ Θεῷ. The import of this I conceive to be, that the Apostle did not serve the God of his Fathers in a formal customary way, as did many of the Jews, but in a more sincere and unfeigned

Way, nor yet by way of Faction, but by way of *Heresie*, according to this way doth he profess to *Worship his God*. And indeed *Josephus* saith in the like manner, without the least Reflection of Ignominy upon any Party, that in the time of *Jonathan* there

were three Heresies amongst the *Jews*, the *Pharisees*, and the *Sadduces*, and the *Essenes*. Now *Josephus* being a great Man amongst the *Jews*, and living at that time *Paul* so

Joseph. Antiq. lib. 13. c. 9.
 $\chi \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \dot{\iota} \chi \rho \delta \nu o v \tau \alpha t o v \tau e \epsilon \epsilon s$
 $\alpha \pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon s \delta \mu \iota \nu d \alpha \iota \alpha v \eta \sigma \alpha v \omega v \dot{\iota}$
 $\mu \nu \omega \alpha \pi \rho \alpha \iota \alpha v \dot{\iota} \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \alpha, \dot{\iota} \delta \dot{\iota}$
 $\sigma \alpha d \alpha \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \alpha v, \dot{\iota} \tau \rho \iota \tau \iota \delta \dot{\iota} \epsilon \sigma \alpha$
 $\omega v.$

spake, it is evident, that the *Jews* did not mean by *Heresie* any Contumely. As for *Q. Mary* in the Book of *Martyrs*, p. 1408. you have an *Inbibition* of hers, in which *She willeth, and straitly chargeth and commandeth, all her good loving Subjects to live together in quiet sort, and good Christian Charity, leaving those new-found devilish Terms of Papist, or Heretick, or such like, and applying their whole Care, Study and Travel, to live in the Fear of God*. And *Q. Elizabeth*, in her *Injunctions*, doth express her Mind thus. Item; *Because in all Alterations, and specially in Rites and Ceremonies, there happeneth Discords among the People, and thereupon slanderous Words and Railings, whereby Charity, the knot of all Christian Society, is loosed: The Queen's Majesty being most desirous of all other earthly things, that her People should live in Charity both towards God and Man, and therein abound in good Works; willeth and straitly commandeth all manner her Subjects,*

to forbear all Vain and Contentious Disputations in matters of Religion, and not to use in Despite or Rebuke of any Person, these contentious Words, Papist, or Papistical, Heretick, Schismatick, or Sacramentary, or any such like words of Reproach. But if any manner of Person shall deserve the Accusation of any such; that first be charitably admonished thereof, and if that shall not amend him, then to denounce the Offender to the Ordinary, or to some higher Power, having Authority to correct the same. Now by this Pattern, may there not be an Edict made, that any Malefactor suffer for his Evil Deeds, without any Reflection upon those ways which he hath professed to walk in towards God? Sure I am that these Injunctions were to be read in every Parish-Church Quarterly, or the Minister to be punished; and when they ceased to be in force, I know not; but it is manifest, that the Puritans vouched their Authority against the Bishops and their Partisans, when they reviled them. Nor is this Proposal so harsh and strange, as that it ought to be resented by the English Clergy, since Mr. Dury (whose Negotiations for Peace betwixt the Calvinists and Lutherans were not only approved of by the respective Churches of both parts beyond Sea, but also by both our Universities, and the London Ministers) he in his account of the Means for Procuring and Establishing Peace, layeth down the ensuing Propositions as necessary:

1 That all names of Parties being odious,
 ' should be abolished on both fides : And
 ' this to be effected partly by perswasion,
 ' and partly by interposition of Autho-
 ' rity.

2. That clamorous and turbulent Fellows,
 ' such as either in their Sermons, or infam-
 ' ous Pamphlets, do traduce others, should
 ' be punished according to what the Laws
 ' inflict upon Calumniators.

3. That Tale-bearers, and such as sow
 ' Discord by false Reports amongst them
 ' who are quietly minded, be repressed and
 ' duly censured.

4. That in Writings and Sermons, where-
 ' in controverted Cases are handled, both
 ' fides use Moderation, not using any con-
 ' tumelious Language, or disgraceful Terms,
 ' against each other, nor imposing upon
 ' them any Opinion, which they have not
 ' asserted in the same words, or which may
 ' not be clearly deduced from them.

In fine, if *Heretie* must be an approbrious Term, I hope in Religion, as well as Civil Affairs, none shall be ignominiously branded, who is not convict, without the benefit of an Action against the Slanderer. Self-condemnation doth not make a Man *legally a Thief*; not yet doth the expref words (much less intricate Passages) of the Law, if unapplyed by the Decision of a living Judge: Why then should a Man be accounted an *Heretick* (a term so much more bitter than the other, as Heaven is above Earth.)

Earth) upon more facile Terms? As the Malefactor whilst unaccused and uncondemned, is not therefore really Innocent, nor ought to think himself so, if he know himself guilty; yet is he so in Law, and must be so reputed as to all outward converse: So though we know a Man to be an *Heretick*, unless the Judge authentically censures him as such, we ought to dismiss him, as Christ did the *Adulteress*, not condemning her, because no Man else had done it. If it be said, that they have been condemned and declared *Hereticks* by *Councils*; I answer so haye the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, yet do not the *Lutherans* thereby prejudice their Tenets, nor yet we, who offer them (as did the *Gallick-Churches*) friendly Communion. Secondly, What Authority had those Councils to condemn them in *England*? I do not now Dispute against the Fallibility and Incogency of Synodal Decrees, which have been sufficiently invalidated by the first *Reformers*; but supposing that for granted, which will be eternally denied, and easily disproved: How comes a petit Assembly at *Nice* or *Chalcedon*, of some Bishops of the Neighbouring Provinces, to give Laws and Decisions for *England*, which I think had no Deputies there? Shall the whole Christian World be obliged by a Council, because the arrogant Greeks call it *Oecumenical*, who yet give the

The Patriarch of Constantinople
was stiled συμμάχος Σαλμας. in Eu-
charist, p. 553. and 659.

same Title to sundry of their Patriarchs

So Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, was by them called *Imperialis, Oecumenical*. As Morney du Plessis provereth in his *Myster. Iniquitat.* and of the several Arch-Bishops which they fondly stiled *Archimandriti*, though some were not so much as *Archimandriti* in their Diocesses, vid. *Selmas. de eccles. Suburbiis ad. Serm. c. 3: p. 510, 511.*

(as to Bishops, the Title of *Catholick-Bishops*) without giving them an universal Power, or any Jurisdiction over each other's Patriarchates? Is the Synod of *Dort* concluding in Britain? Doth

Charenton condemn *Heretics*, for enact Laws for the Province of *London*? Doth the *Saxon Concord* involve us who are no *Saxons*? How then doth the *Greek Determinations* become so valid? And why must so great an authority be ascribed to the first Council of *Nice*, beyond that of *Ariminum, Sinuillium*, or the second *Nicene Council*? If you will, the latter were more *Oecumenical*, and as for the *Emperor's Power*, all had it Equally; there is no advantage to be found, but what a prepossessed Judgment will give.

Q. L. Whether it be not a very great abuse put upon the *Independents* amongst us, to say that They, or their *Tenets*, came from *Amsterdam*? Do not the Doctors that are got amongst them, their stickling for the upholding the present formalized University, and a Tithe-receiving-Ministry (whom yet not long ago they stiled Abominable?) (a) and Parish-Priests (b) and their demeanor towards the Quakers in Oxon, (agreeable

(a) Mr. Owen, of John's College, in *Mary's Pulpit*, called *Parochial Church-Administration Abominable*.

(b) Dr. Owen in his *Book of Schism*.

to a Persecuting, rather than Persecuted Spirit) sufficiently acquit them from having any affinity with those other precious Souls ?

Those that suffered as *Brownists* heretofore, in their Apology against the University of Oxford, amongst other their Positions, have these following.

The Thirteenth Position.

That Popish² Degrees in *Theology*, b enforcement to single Life in Colledges, c abuse of the Study of profane Heathen Writers, with other like Corruptions in Schools and Academies, should be removed and redressed, that so they may be the Well-springs and Nurseries of true Learning and Godliness. ^a 2 *Thess.* 2. 3, 4. *Rev.* 9. 3. and 13. 16, 17, 18. & 16. 13, 14. & 18. 11, 17, 19. with *Ephes.* 4. 11, 12, 13. 1 *Cor.* 12. 5. 28. *Deut.* 18. 15, 18, 19. b 1 *Cor.* 7. 2. 1 *Thess.* 4. 3, 4. 5. 2 *King.* 4. 1. 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. & 4. 1, 3. *Heb.* 13. 4. with *Exod.* 20. 14. c 2 *Tim.* 3. 16, 17. *Deut.* 18. 15. 1 *Sam.* 10. 5, 10. & 19. 20. 2 *King.* 2. 3, 5, 7, 15. *Amos* 7. 14, 15. with *Mattb.* 13. 52. *Psal.* 119. 9, 99, 105, 128. *Ephes.* 6. 4. 2 *Tim.* 2. 2, 15, 16, 23,

I. That Popish Degrees in *Theology* ought to be removed, &c.

i. Because they are Degrees in and for the Ministry, which Christ the Lord never appointed. Which is contrary to 1 *Cor.* 12. 5, 28. *Rom.* 12. 7. 8. *Ephes.* 4. 5, 11, 13. with *Deut.* 18. 15, 18.

2. Because they are derived and retained from Antichrist, the Man of Sin, that hath corrupted the Schools of Learning, together with the Churches themselves. 2 *Tbess.* 2. 3, 4 with *Rev.* 8. 10, 11, 12. & 9. 3. & 16. 4, 13, 14. & 6. 12,--14. & 7. 1. & 14. 8,--11. & 17. 1, 4, 5.—

4. Because they are Pillars and Upholders of Antichristian Prelacy [Presbytery] and Tyranny, seryng to continue and maintain the Throne of the Beast, *Rev.* 13. 11. with 16. 10, 13, & 19. 20.

5. Because as by other, so by this means also the Princes and People of the Earth have been more readily seduced to Error and Iniquity, as by lamentable Experience now many Ages hath found too true. And in this behalf it may also be considered here, Whether by this means, as well as by other, that be not verified which is written of perswading and gathering them to the Battle against the Lord, and against his Truth and People, *Rev.* 16. 13, 14. & 19. 19. & 20. 8, 9. with *Acts* 6. 9. 12.

II. *That inforcement to single Life in Colledges should be redressed, &c.*

1. Because Marriage is honourable among all. *Heb.* 13. 4. 1 *Tim.* 3. 2.

2. Because in *Israil* the Sons of the Prophets and Students in their Schools of Learning were married, 2 *Kings* 4. 1. & 6. 1. With 2 *Kings* 2. 7, 15, 16.

3. Because Marriage is the means appointed by God to avoid Fornication, and enforcement

forcement to single Life the means procuring Fornication and Adulteries, &c.
1 Cor. 7. 2. 1 Thess. 4. 3, 4, 5. with Exod. 20. 14.

4. Because the forbidding of Marriage is a Doctrine of Devils, proceeding from the Spirit of Error; and is also a part and fruit of Antichrist's Defection from the Faith of Christ, 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.

III. That the abuse of the Study of profane Heathen Writers, with other like Corruptions in Schools and Academies, should be removed and redressed, that so they may be the Well-springs and Nurseries of true Learning and Godliness.

1. Because the Work and Fruit of Religion should be seen, and shew it self as well in the Studies of Learning, as in all other Actions of our Lives; and as well among Scholars as other People, Psalm 119. 9, 99, 105, 128. with Mat. 13. 51, 52. 1 Sam. 5. 10. 2 Kings 2. 7, 15, 16. Dan. 9. 2. 2 Tim. 1. 13. & 2. 2, 15.

2. Because the Schools and Universities should be like the Schools of the Prophets in Israel, for Training up the Students, as the Sons of the Prophets, in all good Learning and Godliness, 1 Sam. 19. 20. 2 Kings 2. 3, 5, 7, 15. with Mat. 13. 51, 52. 2 Tim. 2. 2.

3. Because the Scriptures are fully sufficient for all Instruction and Conviction, both for Faith and Conversation, &c. And therefore all other Studies, and Learning, and Courses,

Courses, had in Schools and Universities, to be no farther nor otherwise allowed, than may be warranted by the Word of God, and be serviceable thereunto; whether for the better understanding thereof, or for convincing the Adversaries, or for other good uses in Church and Common-Weal,
2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. Tit. 1. 9. Deut. 18. 15, 18, 19. Isa. 8. 20. & 29. 13, 14. Psalm 19. 7.
Prov. 30. 5, 6. with Rom. 1. 21, 22.
1 Cor. 19. 20.

But because the abuse aforesaid is hurtful many ways: To name some, Hence it is that diverse Preachers stuff their Sermons with the Tales or Testimonies of such profane Writers; not keeping to the Word of God, which is able to save Souls, and to make the Man of God absolutely and fully furnished to every good Work; being profitable to teach, to improve, to correct, and to instruct in Righteousness. Hereupon also more Time is spent by many in such Studies, than in the Studies of the Scriptures, or Tongues, or other good Learning, that might be more profitable for themselves and others. Besides that, hence do often arise, and are more stily held, many Errors, Heresies, foolish Questions, Contentions, Oppositions of Science (falsly so call'd) and other like Corruptions, many ways hurtful, no ways profitable for Church or Commonwealth: And all contrary to
2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. James 1. 21, 22. 1 Pet. 4. 10, 11. with *Acts 17. 2, 3, 10, 11. & 18. 24, 28.*

24, 28. Rom. 1. 21, 22. 1. Cor. 1. 28. & 2.
1, 4. 1 Tim. 1. 4, 7. & 4. 7, 12, 13, 16. &
6. 3, 4, 5, 20, 22. Titus 2. 16, 17, 18, 23. &
3. 15, 19. & 4. 2, 3, 4. Titus 3. 8, 9.

The Seventh Position.

That the due Maintenance of the Ministers should be of the free and voluntary Contribution of the Church, that according to Christ's Ordinance, *They which preach the Gospel, may live of the Gospel, and not by Popish Lordships and Livings, or Jewish Tithes and Offerings.* And that therefore the Lands, and like Revenues, of the Prelates and Clergy yet remaining (being still Baits to allure the *Jesuits* and *Seminaries* into the Land, and Incitements unto them, to plot and prosecute their wonted Evil Courses, in hopes to enjoy them in time to come) may now, by your Highness, be taken away, and converted to better use, as those of the *Abbies* and *Nunneries* were heretofore by your Majesty's Worthy Predecessors, to the Honour of God, and great Good of the Realm. 1 Cor. 9. 7-14. Gal. 6. 6. 1 Thess. 5. 13. 2 Tim. 5. 17, 18. compared with Proverbs 3. 9, 10. and with Num. 18. 8, - 32. Deut. 18. 1, - 5. & 25. 4. 2 Chron. 31. 4, - 21. Nehem. 13. 10, - 14. Mal. 3. 8, 9, 10. Heb. 7. 5, 12. Luke 8. 3. & 10. 7. Rev. 15. 27. 1 Rev. 17. 16. *Item* 2d. *Item* 3d. Because Christ hath ordained, that so it should be now in the time of the Gospel, 1 Cor. 9. 14. Gal. 6. 6. 1 Thess. 5. 13.

2. Be-

2. Because the Law of Tithes did cease with the change of the *Levitical Priesthood*, Heb. 7. 12. and else why did Christ ordain another Maintenance for the Ministry of the Gospel, differing from (yet proportionable unto) that which was for the Priesthood under the Law? 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14. Or why should this Ceremony of the Law be un-abolished by Christ, more than the rest? Num. 18. 24. with Heb. 7. 5, 12. & 9. 10. & 10. 1. Gal. 5. 1, 2, 3. Col. 2. 8,--17.

3. Because God, under the Law, would not have his Ministers (the *Priests* and *Levites*) to have any part or inheritance, as the other *Israelites* had in the Land of *Canaan*, but himself was their Inheritance: Of and by the Offerings and Altar of the Lord they were sustained, Deut. 10. 8, 9. & 18. 1, 5. Josh. 13. 14, 33. According to the Equity whereof, is the Maintenance of the Ministry of Christ now to be, 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14. Where, note also, that as the Ministers of the Gospel ought, in respect of their Ministry, to have their due Maintenance appointed by Christ (that they may, as the other before, be encouraged in the Law of the Lord, and better attend to their Function and Ministry) so may they not for it now, any more than at that time, devise or require any other than is ordained by the Lord himself; for which see the Scriptures alledged before in the Position it self.

4. Because Princes are bound, not only to see the true Ministry and Worship of God established and maintained, according to his Word, but also to take away and convert to other uses the Demeans, Revenues, and Maintenances of any false Ministries, and unlawful Ecclesiastical Functions, within their Dominions. *2 Chron. 31.* with *Deut. 17, 18, 19, 20. Isa. 49. 23. & 60. 3, 10, 11, 12. Psalm 2. 10, 11, 12. 1 Tim. 2. 2.* with *Rev. 17. 16.*

5. Because there should else still remain such a manner of Maintenance, as by which any Ministry that should be received in the Land, though never so Popish or Unlawful, might be maintained: Contray to *Prov. 3. 9, 10. Rev. 17, 16. & 18. 11. Psalm 16. 3, 4.* with *Exod. 20. 4, 5, 6. 1 Cor. 9. 14. & 10. 19, 20, 21, 22. Epb. 5. 11.*

6. Because there is no more Warrant in the Word of God for the Lordships and Livings of the *Prelates* and *Priests* to be continued, than for the *Abby-Lands* of the *Fryers* and *Nuns* to be restored.

7. Because, by the Ordinance of Christ, it should be seen, That the Maintenance of the Ministers belongeth unto them for Preaching the Gospel, and cometh from the People of Love and Duty in that behalf: *1 Cor. 9. 14. 1 Thess. 5. 13. Gal. 6. 6. 1 Tim. 5. 17, 18.* Whereas that which is now in the Land, is such as the *Prelates* and *Priests* do exact (and the People are constrained to yield them) be they never so ungodly,

unlearned, &c. Besides that, the *Jesuits* and *Seminaries*, and other the like, are by this means stirred up to attempt and follow still their Treasonable Practices, hoping for a Day when their Religion may, in the full thereof, enjoy them again; as is before noted in the Position it self.

LI. *Whether (notwithstanding any Priviledges, Grants, or Institutions of private Colledges, or of the University in general) the Supreme Power may not amend, or alter the general Posture of the University, or particularly of private Colledges ?*

Adr. Saravia de imper. author. & christian. obed. l. 2. e. 36.

Seeing the *Institutions and Laws of Colledges*, which were either made by themselves, indulged by Princes, or enacted by their respective Founders, and ratified by them, are not properly *Laws*, but Agreements betwixt them, or Priviledges whereby the Colledges only are obliged, together with them who relate thereto. The Authority of the *Supreme Magistrate* is not so bound by those Constitutions, but that upon good grounds he may, contrary to them, appoint what shall seem unto him fit and most advantagious. It ought not to be accounted a Breach of their *Statutes*, if any thing be ordained extraordinarily by the Magistrate, contrary to the received Customs there, or innovated by his Commands. It is very absurd to think, that the prime Magistrate, who makes and repeals the Laws of

of a whole Kingdom, should be so tied up by the Laws and Priviledges of a private Colledge, or University, so as not to be able to do any thing contrary thereto.

Lewis the Twelfth, of France, being come to the Crown, did make some Edicts, which retrenched upon the Priviledges of the University of Paris: Hereat they repined, and at a publick Convention resolved to intermit the *Academical Exercises*: And the Rector sent to the Preachers to inform the People, That from thenceforward Sermons, and other Scholaſtical Exercises, should cease: Besides, many petulant Speeches were scattered about, to the disgrace of the King and Chancellor. After the first heat was over, they hearing that his Majesty resented such their procedure, they sent some Delegates to him, to excuse the matter, and appease him. George of Amboise, Arch-Bishop of Roven, returned this answer in the King's Name, as Gaguinus relates it: Learned Sirs, You ought not to think it strange, if our most Just King considering several Abuses and Enormities perpetrated, under pretence of several Immunities of yours, hath fixed some bounds for your Priviledges. You cannot be ignorant of what hath happened; and it had become you to have desired first, rather than expected a Reformation, unto which the King was instigated, not by any sudden Caprichio
of

of his own, but by the advice of his
 Council, and able Lawyers: Hereupon it
 was that he set himself to redress Dis-
 orders; and you ought not to have re-
 pugned thereunto, by surceasing you usual
 Exercises and Preaching: Which *Act* of
 yours, no Man can be so weak, as not to
 interpret it as a contempt of his Majesty.
 The King intended not to infringe your
 Just Liberties, but to prevent Fraud and
 Abuses; not to disquiet or discourage you
 in your Studies. He remembers how
 tender his Predecessors were of your
 Tranquility; he acknowledges the great
 Services you have done his Kingdom,
 and the universal State of *Christendom*:
 But your Posture cannot be allowable,
 which may be so abused and intrigued
 with unlawful Affairs. The King is of
 this mind, nor doth his Conscience regret
 it. He had rather have a few Studious
 and Orderly Persons, than a Rude Mu-
 titude of Peevish and Malapert Scholars.
 Endeavour so to compose your Manners,
 that you may obey the King, and pro-
 cure the Repute of Wisdom; for the at-
 taining whereof your Societies were
 erected: If you shall thus demean your
 selves, then shall the King take you into
 his Special Favour, and your Priviledges
 will be augmented. After that the Arch-
 Bishop had done speaking, the Deputies
 asked, If the King intended them any
 farther reply? Whereupon he said, Re-
 member

member me to those of my Scholars,
 which deserve that name ; for the others,
 I esteem them not. And laying his hand
 upon his Royal Breast, he said, They have
 reviled me in their Preachings, but I shall
 send them to Preach else-where. The
 Wrath of the King was just (faith *Sera-
 via*) for so much as they, who ought
 to have been Exemplary in Moderation
 and Obedience, had contumeliously abus'd
 him in the publick Assembly.

LII. *Whether the usual Respect of Persons,
 and Complemental Addresses, particularly that
 of Your Servant, be Lawful, and have not been
 anciently condemned ? (a)*

James 2. verse 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,
 10, 11, 12. *My Brethren, have not the Faith
 of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory,
 with Respect of Persons. For if there come into
 your * Assembly a Man
 with a Gold Ring, in good-
 ly Apparel, and there come
 in also a poor Man in vile*

* The word signifies any manner of
 Assembly, and not only an Ecclesiasti-
 cal one. *Jer. 31. 4, 13.* and frequent-
 ly else in the Septuagint.

*Rayment: And ye have respect to him that
 weareth the gay Clothing, and say unto him,
 Sit thou here in a good Place; And say to the
 Poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my Foot-
 stool: Are ye not then partial in your selves, and
 are become Judges of evil Thoughts? Harken,
 my beloved Brethren, Hath not God chosen the
 Poor of this World, Rich in Faith, and Heirs of
 the Kingdom which he hath promised to them
 that love him? But ye have despised the Poor.*

Q

D.

Do not Rich Men oppress you, and draw you before the Judgment-Seats? Do not they Blasphem the worthy Name by the which you are called? If ye fulfil the royal Law, according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self, ye do Well. But if ye have Respect to Persons, ye commit Sin, and are convinced of the Law as Transgessours. For whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit Adultery, said also, Do not Kill. Now if thou commit no Adultery, yet if thou Kill, thou art become a Transgressor of the Law. So speak you, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the Law of Liberty.

*Marlorat
out of Lu-
ther and Cal-
vin.*

To Respect Persons here, is to have regard unto the outward Habit and Garb, and accordingly to Esteem or Undervalue him, Love or Dread him. The Apostle signifies that such Respecting of Persons doth so repugn with true Faith, that they are Inconsistent: For, by Faith we are united into one Body, wherein Christ is Principal: But if the Pomp and other worldly Regards prevail, and weaken what is of Christ it is a Sign of a decaying Faith.— Yea, so great is the Glory and Splendor of Christ in a Pious Soul, that all the Glories of the World have no Attracts, no Beauty in Comparison of that, unto one so disposed. He judges of the sincerity of Faith and Charity by such difference; and makes the practise thereof to be against the Light within them, so as that they who

‘ who follow such usages, condemn themselves. — His reason against contempt of the Poor is, You ought not to Slight such as God Honours: But he who hath regard to the Rich, and undervalueth others that are not, doth invert the course which God takes, who enriches those with Faith, who are indigent as to outward Substance. — His reason against the Rich is, That the tendency of them (however some may well use them) is to make the owners Insolent and Oppressive, and Aliens to the Name and Power of Christ; so that it is clear he makes Sanctity to be the motive of outward Respect, and that none is to be honoured upon the account of Riches (which render it presumptuous, that he is an Oppressor rather) but Holiness.

Whether it be *Paulinus*, or *Jerome*, I know not, but in the works of the latter there is an Epistle to a Noble Matron, *Celantia*, directing her how to live in the midst of her Riches and Honours, and this is part of his Direction to her:

‘ Heed not your Nobility, nor do you thereupon take place of any; repute not those who are of a lower Extraction, to be your Inferiors. Our Religion admits no Respect of Persons; nor doth it lead us to value the outward Condition of Men, but their Inward Frame of Spirit; it is hereby that we pronounce Men Noble, and Base. With God, not to serve

'Sin is to be Free ; and to excell in Virtue,
 'is to be Noble. — God hath chosen the
 'Mean and the Contemptible of this World,
 'whereby to humble the Great Ones : Be-
 'sides, it is folly for any to boast his Gen-
 'tility, since all are equally esteemed by
 'God ; the Ransom of the Poor and Rich
 'cost Christ an equal expence of Blood ;
 'nor is it material in what estate a Man is
 'Born, the New Creature hath no *dissi-*
 'tions ; but if we will forget how we all
 'descended from one Father, at least we
 'ought perpetually to remember that we
 'have one Saviour. Nor was this only
 the *Doctrine* of a single Person ; *Casaubon*
 in his Book of *Use and Custom*, hath a pas-
 sage of greater moment ; 'He is not count-
 ed a Civil Man now of late Years amongst
 us, that thinks much to subscribe himself
 'Servant, though it be to his Equal or In-
 ferior. Yet *Sulpitius Severus* was once soundly
 chid by *Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola*, for sub-
 scribing himself his Servant, in a Letter of his.
 'In the Title of my Letter I have not in all things
 'imitated your excellent Brotherhood, because I
 'thought it more secure to write the Truth.
 Take heed hereafter how you, being from a
 'Servant, called out unto Liberty, do subscribe
 'your self Servant, unto one who is your Brother
 'and Fellow-Servant. For it is a Sinful Flat-
 'tery, not a Testimony of Humility, to pay
 'those Honours to a Man, and a Sinner, which
 'are due to the one Lord, one Master, and one
 'God.

LIII. Whether it be a peculiar Practice of our Modern Anabaptists and Quakers, that they will not Swear, no not before a Magistrate? Or whether it were not an Opinion of the Waldenses, Antecessors of the Protestants, and so celebrated in our Book of Martyrs, whose extent was over the Face of the whole Earth, and whose Antiquity is either of as old Date as the time of the Apostles, or at least as Pope Silvester in the time of Constantine?

If the peevishness of these days of ours had not convinced me, I should never have imagined that an exceeding Tenderness for the Commandments of Christ, could have disguised any. But that the Observation of a Command so Positive, as I know none more; so enforced, as that Condemnation is awarded to the Transgressours, should bring upon any Men the greatest Obloquy imaginable, would surprise any not yet inured to Miracles. The Old Law permitted Swearing upon due Circumstances, it did not prohibit the taking of the Lord's Name absolutely into one's Mouth, but that it should not be *Taken in Vain*, and that Men should not commit Perjury. But Christ in opposition to this formerly legitimated way of Swearing, bids Men *Swear not at all*. And to prevent all Cavils, as if the subsequent Oaths had restrained this meaning to such Oaths as are there expressed, he adds, Let your *Language* be *Yea, Yea; and Nay, Nay*: What it is more than this, is from the Devil, *Mattb.* 5. 37.

And if we compare this passage of our Sa-
 viour's with that of James 5. 12. we shall
 not find any way to elude the Text by un-
 written Distinctions. Whether the first
 word signific *Swear not*, *my Brethren*, before
 any Man: Or, *Above all things*, *Swear not*:
 Or, *Though all lye at Stake Swear not*, is all
 manner of Oaths; and not all of such a kind
 prohibited: And the reason is, *Lest you fall*
 into Condemnation; under whose Condemna-
 tion can they fall, who are in Jesus Christ,
 and who count it a small thing to be judg-
 ed by Man's Day? Surely of none but the
Living God.

If these plain Texts may not excuse any
 Person, fearing God in a Congregation,
 professing Christianity, I despair of ever
 fulfilling the Apostles Command, of being
 ready always to give an answer, to every Man
 that asketh me a reason, of the hope that is in
 me; *with Meekness and Fear.* How justly
 soever I may be possessed with Fear, when
 I give an account of such an hope, as
 thwarteth such Scriptures as these, yet I
 think I should own little of Meekness. It
 is reported of the *Waldenses*, that They con-
 demned all manner of Swearing as unlawful.
 So *Parsons*, *Saunders*, *Coccius*. And a Ger-
 man Writer, did esteem it a piece of Wit
 and Raillery, to say; That the *Hereticks*,
 which *Swear not*, are like to the Devil, who
 is not read to have used any Oath. They made
 it their care to avoid Swearing and Lying;
 and hereby they did give sufficient Cauti-

on against all Inconveniences which might emerge thereby, as to Government in general. For where a Promise, or Assertion, made without any Oath, is as sure as if it had been Sworn to; I conceive the taking of an Oath, would be but a taking God's Name in Vain. However, since Bishop Usher doth esteem that place of *Mattb.* 5. 37. to be a sufficient Apology for the *Waldenses*; they who have any esteem for him, ^{de success.} c. 6. must not condemn the *Quakers*. As for the Number, and Antiquity, of the aforesaid *Waldenses*, mentioned in the Query, though none can be ignorant of them, who hath looked beyond *Luther* for Protestantancy: Yet I shall set down the words of *Reynierius*, one of the Popish Inquisitors, as he is cited by Bishop Usher, ' Amongst all the Sects which ^{de success.} c. 8. either are, or have been, there is not any more pernicious to the Church, than the *Leunitis*, or *Waldenses*: And that for three Reasons: The First is, Because it is the most Ancient in continuance; for some say, it hath continued ever since Pope *Sylvester*; others, ever since the time of the Apostles: Secondly, Because it is the most Universal, for there is scarce any Land, where this Sect hath not fixed it self. Thirdly, &c. *Jansenius* (a Papist) in his *Evangelical Concord*, c. 40. p. 285. doth teach that the *Waldenses* (as well as *Anabaptists* of late) did protest it to be no way Lawful for a Christian to Swear upon any occasion: Of the same Judgment, he saith, also were

the Pelagians, who yet did hold it to be no Oath to say, *I call God to witness,* or *God is my witness,* because that Paul useth those Expressions; ony to say *By God,* that they held to be an Oath; which, that it was their Judgment, he cites Austin, Epist. 89. in respons. ad 5 quest. It is true, Austin refutes them by saying, That God in the Old Testament did not only permit often, but enjouyn to Swear in some Cases, Deut. 6. 13. *I thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and thou shalt swear by his Name.* So Exod. 22. 10, 12. If a Man deliver to his Neighbour an Ass, or an Ox, or a Sheep, or any Beast to keep, and it dye, or be hurt, or driven away, no Man seeing of it: Then shall an Oath of the Lord be between them both, that he bath not put his hands unto his Neighbours Goods: And the Owner of it shall accept thereof, and he shall not make it good. But hereunto *Fansarius* faith, they answier, 'That the Jews were permitted to Swear, but not the Christians, who are totally prohibited it in this Precept of our Saviour's. And this they prove out of *Jerom*, who faith upon the place, 'It was permitted under the Law to the Jews, as being tender, and as it were Infants, that as they were to offer Sacrifices to God, lest they should Sacrifice to Idols; so they might Swear by God, nor that it was rightful so to do, but because it was better to Swear by the Lord, than by false Gods or Devils. But the great Evangelical Sincerity and Truth admits NOT

' of

' of an Oath, since every true Saying, is e-
 ' quivalent thereunto. In like manner doth
 Theophilact upon the place in Controversie
 say, ' Learn hence, that then it was not evil
 ' for one to Swear, but since the Coming of
 ' Christ it is evil, as is Circumcision; and an
 ' sum, whatever is Judaical. For it may be
 ' come a Child to suck, but not a Man. And
 whereas it is replied further, That an Oath
 cannot be bad, because even God himself
 doth use them frequently in Scripture? They
 answer thus, That it becomes God alone to
 Swear, because he alone is true, and cannot
 Lye; but all Men are Liars. And this they
 prove out of Ambrose upon Psal. 118. who
 comments thus upon that verse, *Justus & fa-
 tui, &c. Non debet Swear aribyr, but he that
 knows what he Sways. The Lord has Sworn, and
 will not repent, Psal. 110.v.4. Let him then Swear,*
who canno repent of his Oath. And a little after, the
 same Ambrose addeth, *Do not imitate him in
 Swearing, whom you cannot imitate in fulfilling.*
**NOLI USURPARE EXEMPLUM SACRA-
 MENTI QUI IMPLENDI SACRAMENTUM
 NON HABES POTESTATEM.** And in-
 deed the principal Solution given, is, *Swear
 not at all; that is, Swear not as far as you are
 able, and it shall lye in your Power.* As Murder
 is absolutely prohibited, yet it is lawful in some
 cases; so is it, saith *Jansenius* with Oaths; how
 weak this is, let any conscientious Man judge:
 and if it be ever lawful for a Christian to Swear,
 yet Woe be to them that reduce him to such
 necessities that he must Swear; as Woe attends
 them that necessitate him to Kill. *The*

and leaving out what could be done to
the main Argument, and leaving
nothing but the plain Evidence
left you as if nothing were done. Yet
Reader,

THOU hast here a few *Questions* proposed
by one who desires to lie low in his
own Eyes, and after all his Reading, rather
to doubt (doubting is no more the way to
Error, than to Truth) than to affirm. I know
not what some fierce and interested Replier
may say, and that with a proportionate Con-
fidence; yet this thou mayst be assured of,
That the Citations here are not intruded upon
thee at second hand, being not Transcribed
out of Mens Writings that mis-alleged them,
but fetched from their Original Authors; He
who queried, did not so much as trust his
Memory, or *Juvenile Collection*, but brought
all to the Test, by a faithful Review. The
Interrogatories are of such a Moment, that he
thought they might deserve a satisfactory
Answer; And he had observed, That nei-
ther the Pulpit-peers, nor Writers of these Times,
did contribute by their Labours any thing
towards such Conscience-Work, though the
Posture of their Affairs require it. He
thought fit, in his *Questions*, to produce such
Testimonies as made for the Negative and
Heterodox Part. Unto which Process he was
inclined by several Reasons: One is, Because
that the general Prejudices of many in this
Age are such, That if he had not done this,
they would not have thought *these things*
questionable.

Questionable. Secondly, He had a tender regard to those who have made the Subject of these *Querries* to be their *Assertions*: In the behalf of these he did set down what you see, that their Opponents (though they pride themselves with the conceit of *Learning*, and esteem of others as *Illiterate*) may at last own them for less than *Fanatics* and groundless *Opinionists*. He did not alledge any Proofs for the other part, both because he knew that others would do that for him, as also because he had not that esteem for *Quotations* to the contrary, which he had for these; not that he is much prepossessed through *Prejudice*, but upon an *old Protestant Consideration*, that *Records* and *Precedents* differing from the received *ways* and *interests* of Men, are more to be regarded than any that make for them; since the *Forgeries* and *Falsifications* of precedent Ages, make it probable, that such *Passages* might be inserted and foisted in; but why, or how, these should be adulterated, he did not see. Even in Matters of common *Transaction*, in our English Course of *Judicature*, he thought he had been told, That one *Precedent* or *Verdict* against the *Jurisdiction* of a *Court*, is of more *Validity* than a *Thousand* for it; because it is supposed, that none will, contrary to *Right* and *Equity*, infringe their own *Power*. Farther, If any should oppose the *Sayings* of others, in behalf *Humane Learning*, to what he had vouch'd, he hoped they would produce them out of Authors *contemporaries* with

with his ; or else they should not imagine that he would think any such Averments to be contradictory to what his *Query* may seemingly assert, nor yet satisfactory to the Question : Nor doth he think (and *Heraclitus*, *Ouzelius*, and others, concur with him here in) that out of Antiquity they can alledge any such Quotations. If they oppose his *Query* with the practice and use of Humane Learning, which is found in *Clem. Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, *Minutius Felix*, &c. he shall not think such dealing to be fair, since the Question is, *What is their Judgment ? Not, What they did Practice ?* Of the latter, no Man will suppose the Querist to be ignorant ; and if any should, yet would the Objection be of no value, until they shall evince, That every Man did in those times *Live up to the Light be bad, and acted as he spake.* He thinks it may have been with the *Ancients*, as with that excellent *Methodist in Musick*, who being sick of a Fever, a Friend visited him, and found him drinking *Wine* ; whereupon he charged him with having formerly prohibited the use thereof in Fevers by his Writings : The Infirm replied, *In my Books you see the Practice of Physick, but in me the Practice of Physicians.* He supposes, that after Persons have been brought over from *Paganism* to *Christianity*, something may stick by them, as an ill Scent may, when one comes out of a Jakes ; yet that is their Failing, not their Justification. If *Moses* learn'd

learn'd the Egyptian Skill, it was whilst he remained in Pharnob's Court: And so Paul was learn'd in Heathen Authors, but it was before he came to the School of Christ; he hath used them but three or four times in his Works, whereas now they are more frequent than Texts of Scripture. * Athanasius against the Gentiles, faith, *The Scriptures are sufficient to declare the Truth of themselves*; and that if his Friend Macarius did read other Religious Writers, it was but φιλοκίλως, a Lover of Elegance, not as a Lover of Christ. Other things there were, which he will not now insist upon, having weighed them in the Ballances, and found them light. About the Call of the Ministry, and the First Reformers, he hopes not to be opposed with the after-judgment of Luther, or the rest: He is not of their Opinion, who

κατὰ χριστὸν πίστιν ἀπεῖδεν
δεῖνα λογίων ταῦτα ἄντειν, φιλοκίλως δὲ ὅμως καὶ παρ ἐπίφρων
ἀκόντι, αὐτάρκεις μὲν γέρεσσιν εἰς σύνταξην καὶ διδόνεντος γραφῶν
πρὸς τὸ ταῦτα ἀπαγγελεῖν. Athan. or. contr. Gent. in invic.

thinks

* Athanasius begins his Discourse, against the Gentiles, to Macarius thus: *The Knowledge of Godliness, and that Truth which is all in all, doth not so much stand in need of Humane Teachings, and that Learning which is from Men, as that it bath not sufficient Discoveries from it self; for it doth as it were cry aloud daily in its Works, and manifests its self more clearly than the Sun through the Doctrine of Christ. But seeing you, Macarius, do desire to be particularly informed thereof, I shall, as far as I am able, give a brief account of the Faith in Christ; though you might indeed learn it your self out of the Sacred Writ, wherein it is to be found, or hear it from others by way of Curiosity:* Ή μὴ περὶ τὸ θεοτεῖον, καὶ τὸ θεῖον ἔλων ἀληθέας γνῶσις, ἡ τοῦτον τὸ παρα θεῖον αἰθράπτων διδασκαλίας δεῖται, ὃ σεν αἴρειτος ἔχει τὸ γνώμονος μονογενῆ καὶ γὰρ χαῖτημέραν τοῖς ἑργασίαις, καὶ Ἡλίῳ λαμπρότερον διαυτὸν διά τὸ τὸ χριστὸν διδασκαλίας ἕπειδεκτα πόνοντι, δὲ σοι ὅμως τὰ περὶ ταῦτα ἀκέσσαι, φέρε, ὁ Μακάριος, ὃς ἂν ὅσοι τὰ ὡς μὲν, ὀλίγα τὸ δικαρδίῳ μὲν σὺν καὶ τῷ θεῖον

thinks the first *Reformers* did use that Artifice, of bending a crooked Stick, as much the other way, that so it may at last become straight: Such dealings are not to be admitted in the service of our God, who is a Consuming Fire: It is to charge them with a great Hypocrisie (since they never owned any such Actions, but delivered all as precious and glorious Truths) and to make them guilty of the Ruine of those poor Souls, who died in the Profession of a Belief, their Teachers did not intend them. In fine, it is to make the first *Reformation* as bad (or not much better) a way as that of *Papery*; and all that embrace it, and adhere thereunto, to be in a different only, and sinful Estate. It is a slur to the greatest Wonder God hath produced, after the Churches being 1200 Years in the *Wilderness*: How much more ought we to prejudge all succeeding times from their Doctrines? And having such Pregnant Motives to believe they were Spirited by God, let us impute their after-change to falling upon Carnal Considerations; when *Luther* went to settle himself *Pope* in *Germany*, and his *Writings* were advanced as the *Test of Truth*; and an Oligarchy of *Ministers* settled else-where: Let us own our *Reformation* to God, and not *Belial*, or *Antichrist*; to the Call and Excitement of the former, not Consecration of the latter: Let us acknowledge their Zeal, their Charity, and those more Glorious Principles of Spiritual Graces, rather than

than Prudential Contrivements. Are not those their First Works, which are here quoted? Are not those the works by which *Luther* said he would have Men and Angels tried? If you say, that there is a difference betwixt a Church settled and unsettled, a Question would arise (if that can be questioned) Whether the Papists did not say, their Church was then settled? And whether any Settlement political will suffice to debar those Actings? For then the first Reformers, yea, first Christians, and Christ himself, all are cast. If only what is a Settlement of *Truth*, or *Gospel-Settlement*, be intended, doth not this resolve all into a *Trial of Doctrines*, and a proof that the present Way is the sole *Gospel-Way*? Which, whosoever shall avow, he need not want employment for his Thoughts, from the several Writings of Papists, Episcoparians, Presbyterians, Independents, &c. however the *Questionist* should rest.

Luther adu. falso nominatum ordinem Episcoparum. t. 2. fol. 307.
e. 1. edit. *Wittenberg*. & *ibid.* f. 333.
adu. regum. Angliae. e. 1.

But I think I have, in the subsequent Discourses, sufficiently debated the Case and Constitution of the *Ministry*, especially as to the *Negative* part; and I hope none will be so unreasonable as to expect from me all things at once: *Leisure*, and the Circumstances we fall into, shall determine the farther Publication of my *Thoughts*. Some will be apt to clamour, That which I here say about *Tithes, Clergy, and Universities,*

versities, &c. is a carrying on of the Popish Contrivances, for the restoring of that Religion. This same was objected to the Brownists at Amsterdam heretofore, by the Heads and Doctors of the University of Oxon. And I hope what those Godly Men did reply then, whose Sincerity renders them free from abetting, or carrying on, any Romish Designs, may not be unseasonably

*Apolog. for
the Brown-
ists, p. 83.*

*can be ignorant that the Papists would not at
any hand have the overbrow thereof; but
that it doth them good at Heart, to see the
continuance of it still in the Land? Hath it
not also been, and still is, one of the Special
Means they have to keep them in hope of their
long expected Day? And do not themselves
affirm, * That it is their Religion which
erected and built all the Churches, Hos-
pitals, and Ancient Colledges in Christen-
dom, endowed them with Livings, insti-
tuted the Universities and Seminaries, di-
stinguished the Multitudes into Parishes,
proportioned the Tithes, annexed the
Glebe-Land, founded the Bishopricks, li-
mited the Diocesses, decreed Ecclesiastical
Laws and Immunities, &c. founded the
Ecclesiastical Censures, and sorts of Dis-
cipline, as Suspension, Interdiction, Ex-
communication, Irregularity, Degradation,
and the like; and was also the Author
of the Canon Law, and many points,
both of her Censures, Laws and Disci-
pline, practised by the Protestants them-
selves;*

*Papists sup-
plic. to the
King, In
the Recd. of
Relig. p. 6.
& 15.*

' selves: And that without such their
 ' Churches Provision and Ordinances, the
 ' Religion (in England) could never have
 ' carried the Exterior Show it doth. Thus
 ' have the Papists themselves written: And
 ' would they then have the overthrow of
 ' that, which they challenge as their own,
 ' after which they long earnestly ; and for
 ' which they leave no means unattempted,
 ' that they might enjoy it again, as hereto-
 ' fore they have done? Yea, and I am
 more apt to believe, would not, when I
 seriously consider what effects the Dissolu-
 tion of *Abbies* had in Qu. *Marry's* days, to
 the excluding of Popery, and how the
Albigenses and *Piedmontane* Protestants have
 preserved their Religion incorrupt longer
 than any Church, with an endowed Cler-
 gy, in the World; yea, that Christianity
 it self in the Primitive Times did neither
 want able Pastors, nor was so disquieted
 with Political Complying Opinions, Cu-
 riosities, &c. until *Constantine* began to en-
 rich the Churches, at what time a Voice
 was heard from Heaven, *This day poison*
bath been shed in the Church; and of which
 Act of his *Dantes*, the famous *Italian* sing-
 eth thus, as the excellent Mr. *J. Milton*
 doth render it in English blank Verse:

I. M. of
Reform. p.
30.

*Ab Constantine, of how much ill was cause
 Not thy Conversion, but those rich Demeans
 That the first wealthy Pope receir'd of thee?*

R

And

And Chaucer brings in his *Plow-Man*,
1 part. stanz. 28. telling a Tale, which the
Lancashire-Ministers late Rebellion puts me
in mind of:

The Emperor tafe the Pope sometime,

So bigb Lordship bim about,

So that at last the silly Kine,

The proud Pope put him out.

So of this Realm is no doubt,

But Lords beware and them defend;

For now these Folks be wonderous stout,

The King and Lords now shal amend.

But since whatever I say may possibly
be looked upon as *Time-serving*, and not
spoken out of a due Inquiry into the po-
litical of Affairs, which would happen upon
so great Changes and Alterations, as to the
Ministry, I shall recommend to the City
of London some Verses of their Poet Lau-
reate, the famous *Spencer*, who died too
many Years ago, that he should write out
of favour to any in our Times; and I
think he was not deemed a *Sectarian*. In
the Eclogue of *May*, under the false Shep-
herd *Palinode*, he lively Personates our *Pres-
byterian Ministers*, whose whole Life is a
Recantation of their Pastoral Vow; and
whose Profession to forsake the World, as
they use the matter, boggs them deeper
into the World: Those he inveighes against
(as I may say) not without some presage
of these Reformating Times.

The time was once, and may again return,
 (For oft may happen that hath been beforen.)

When Shepherds had none Inheritance

Ne of Land, nor fee in sufferance,

But what might arise of the bare Sheep,

(Were it more or less) which they did keep.

Well ywis, was it with Shepherds tho' ;

Nought having, nought fear'd they to forego.

For Pan himself was their Inheritance,

And little them serv'd for their Maintenance ;

The Shepherds God so well them guided,

That of nought were they unprovided :

Butter enough, Honey, Milk, and Whay,

And their Flock fleeces them to array.

But tract of time, and long Prosperity,

(That Narre of Vice, thus of Insolency)

Lulled the Shepherds in such security,

That not content with Loyal Obeysance,

Some gan to gape for greedy Governance,

And match themselves with mighty Potentates,

Lovers of Lordships, and Troublers of States.

Then gan Shepherds Swaines to look aloft,

And leave to live hard, and learn to lig soft.

Tho' under colour of Shepherds some while.

There crep'd in Wolves, full of fraud and guile,

That often devoured their own Sheep,

And often the Shepherds that did them keep.

This was the first scourge of Shepherd's sorrow,

That now will be quit with bale, nor borrow.

Some perhaps may expect that I should, in the Discourse of Tithes, have said something concerning Abraham's paying Tithes to Melchizedec, and Jacob's vowing them to

the Lord: But I thought the Consideration of them to be impertinent to the Discourse. For what is it to our *Ministers*, if Jacob having received a Promise of the Land of Canaan, that his Posterity should possess it, Gen. 28. 13. doth thereupon *Vow* unto God, that of all God should give, he would surely give him the *Tenth*? It is a *Vow*, voluntary, made with an *If*: v. 20. *And Jacob vowed a Vow, saying, If God will be with me, &c.* I see not that he payed any before, or that he repents for having not payed them; nor yet that ever he payed them after his *return*; nor do I know to whom he should pay them; for since his *goodness extended not to the Lord*, he could not give them to God as *Personally present*, nor to any *Priests*; for God had no constituted *Priesthood*, but the *Eldest or First-born of every Family*, he was *Priest to the Family*; and this was *Jacob*, by virtue of that Birth-right which he had purchased of his Brother *Esau*. As for the Conjectures of some, who imagined that he *might have payed them to some other Priest*, not *expressed*; I reply; That I imagine too that *he did not*. But we are come to a fine pass, if *Dreams* and *Conjectures* shall establish a *Divine Right*, and that *Particular Actions* shall argue a *Moral Duty*. By virtue of *Jacob's Vow*, the Tenth of that Land, which the Lord should give him in his Posterity, became *due to God*, who disposed of it to the *Levites and Priests*: Levit. 27. 30. *All the Tithe of the Land; whether of the Seed of*

the Land, or of the Fruit of the Tree, is the Lord's; it is Holy unto the Lord. If it had been as positively Revealed concerning all the World, as it is concerning Palestine the Divine Right, if not Moral, had been unquestionable. But though it be written, That *the Earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof*, Psalm 24. 1, & 89. 11. So, without Exceptions, it is written, *The Earth hath he given to the Children of Men*, Psalm 115. 16. And since there is no Revelation in the Old, nor Precept in the New Testament, for paying *Tithes*, (which had been as easily mentioned as a General Maintenance, and was very material ; it being as a Duty, not Charity, imprinted in and required of Man, as Man) I think the Dispensation may be recounted amongst the Singularity of the Jewish Polity ; and that we are not obliged at all thereby : Nor by that singular Fact of *Abraham*, who at his return from *Lot's* rescue, and the slaughter of the Kings, Gen. 14. 17. having restored to the King of *Sodom* what Goods were his, and had been taken from him in the War, out of the remaining *Spoils* he gave a Tenth unto *Melchizedec*, King of *Salem*, who met him in the King's Dale with *Bread and Wine*. If we will say, that he gave *Tithe* of all that ever he had, yet since it is not recorded as his Custom and constant Usage, but as an extraordinary thing, I should not conclude any thing therefrom, until I hear that all *Actions* are *Examples*, and that what

a Saint ever did, or Patriarch, that becomes, Obligatory, and binds with a Moral or Divine Right.

He that should lie and think to Eternity, would find as little imprinted in Man, as to the Quota, or Tenth part, as there is strength in an Argument from a singular instance.

The *Mysteries* found in the Number of Ten are quitted by the Patriots of *Tithes*; and Nicok la Maistre saith, He cannot perceive any *Validity* in that Reason, whereby to demonstrate the *necessary* of *Tithes*; since a good Wit may find out *Mysteries* in any number,

De bonis.
Eccl. part.
20. l. 1. c.
3.

Vid. Irenæ-
um Lugdu-
nens. l. 1.
adv. haeres.
Valens. c.

15.

La Maistre.
p. 2. l. 1.
c. 2.

and as easily stamp Wonderful Discoveries therein, as Jupiter did in that Cloud, where-with he deluded Ixion. If the Question be concerning the *Seventh-Day-Sabbath* being Moral, then Divines find out the *Mysteries* of the Number, of Seven; and upon other occasions, in other Numbers, even to Twelve: As I remember, *Heynes*, in his *Survey of the Scriptures* (tho' I have not the Book by me now) doth in an entire Chapter show. As for the several Examples of the *Heavens*, they being not of Nations, but Persons, (except the *Sabæi*, who Tithed to their Priest *Frankincense*, but nothing else) not by way of constant payment, but upon some extraordinary Emergency, either by way of particular Gain to Merchants, or other Trades, or of Victory to Captains and Kings; who, out of hope, did often *view* the *Tenths* of what should accrue to them; I am far from thinking this

Id. ibid.c.1.

this sufficient to prove an Obligation by the Law of Nature; any more than it is Natural to put to Death upon a *Mutiny* in the Army every Tenth Man; or upon a Revolt, because the *Romans* and *Greeks* usually did so; or that he who makes a false Demand of Money, or refuses to pay what had been lent him, should pay, if he be cast, the Tenth Moity to the publick Exchequer; as the *Greeks* and *Romans*, and the Inhabitants of *Montpelier*, practised of old, or do still. So Taxes, if imposed on Subjects, should be the Tenth of their Estates: For thus did *Pisistratus* at *Athens*, and the *Romans* usually, and the *Turks* now, and the Kings of *France* heretofore. From all that hath been said, it appears, not that there is any consequence in the Argument, that because they were upon occasion payed, or it may be sometimes constantly, therefore it was upon an *Instinct* of Nature. He that gives more or less in an Alms, or he who on a Die casts this or that number, or such like cases, acts by a Lottery, as it were, not impulse; nor can they give a better account (setting aside Prudential Motives in laying Taxes; which, if performed by example, are less burdensome: Or Superstition in point of Worship, which was counted more Solemn, if render'd after the *Egyptian* way) than he in *Pontanus*, who was very solicitous why *Homer* made the first word of his *Illiad* to be μῆνις after many *Criticisms*,

(as that the Author intended at first to write 48 Books, and hinted that in the two first Letters, * &c.) he went to ask *Homēr* himself, who replied, That *it good sooth* it was the first word that came into his mind. If *Tithes* were so due by the Law of Nature, how comes this instinct to cease in the first Christians, who, by Grace, being divested of vulgar Prejudices, could distinguish what was of the Law of Nature better than the *Heathens*? What mean those frequent Donations, by which they are given to such and such places, recorded in Church-History? Why is not an entire *Tenth* every where payed, or required, but in some places a *Twelfth*, a *Fifteenth*, a *Twentyeth*? I urge not that the Ministers are not the Tenth part of the People; for it may be proved, that the *Levites* were not in *Israel*, no nor *Judah*; though, notwithstanding that, it may be also replied, That so great a Maintenance, with several Cities, was attributed to the *Priests*; because, as *Josephus* informs us, amongst the *Jews* the *Priesthood* was the *Nobility*, they made up the greatest and most honourable part in all *Judicatories*; whereas there is no such thing now. But supposing the *Divine Rights of Tithes*, and that *Melchizedec* received them as *Priest*, (a thing not to be proved by a *Parenthetical Discourse in Genesis*: And that Church of the *Latines*, which introduced *Tithes*, did not own the Epistle to the *Hebrews*) How then came

La Maij. n.
p. 2. l. 1.
c. 5.

came they to claim them as due under the New Testament, when there are no *Priests*? If under the Old Testament, *Abraham* did pay them to *Melchizedec*, and not before; and if *Jacob* vowed the Tenth of all the Lord should give him, but payed them not that we can find, for want of a Person duly to receive them; What evidence have we that these Men ought to receive our Tithes? Howbeit that our Young Men should see *Visions*, as the Old Men dream *Dreams*, of their being due by Divine Right? Are we to pay them to every one that shall claim them? But I shall not enlarge any farther herein, beyond what I have in the fore-going Book presented thee with, only take this of the Primitive Ministry, as I have faithfully represented it in an Extract out of *Antonius de Dominis*, the learned Bishop of Spalato, *de Repub. Eccles.* l. 9.

Christ himself, though he were the Lord of Heaven and Earth, and the fulness thereof, yet would not he be possessed of great Lands and Incomes; though he seemingly complaineth that the Fowls of the Air have their Nests, and Foxes their Holes; but not the Son of Man where to rest his Head, Luke 9. 58. Yet did not he imbetter his Condition, although to the effecting thereof, there needed no more than that he should will it to be so. Nor did he demand Tithes, tho' a Priest after the Order of Melchizodec indubitably; but whilest he went thorough the Cities and Castles, Preaching the Gospel,

spel, and instructing Men for the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Twelve with him; several Women, as, Mary Magdalen, Joanna, Susanna, and others, did Minister unto him of their Substance, Luke 8. 1, 2. Nor did he otherwise Instruct his Apostles, who were to be his Ambassadors on Earth towards Mankind: In the beginning, when he sends them out, he doth not bid them receive Tithes, or Teach the People to pay them, but bids them to live upon Alms: Carry not with you Gold, or Silver, or any Money in your Purses; not a Srip, nor a pair of Shoes, nor two Coats, nor a Staff supernumerary; for the Labourer is worthy of his Meat, Matth. 10. 9. If one now should ask our Ministers by what Right do they claim Tithes? They cannot say by a better Right than the Apostles had; They pretend to be but the Successors of them: And if you ask them the extent of their Commission, you shall have it in these words forthwith, As the Father sent me, so send I you: But if one should demand whether they will stand to such a Deputation in other Respects, I have little hopes they will comply in point of Maintenance; tho' it be far more evident than the perpetuity of an imposed officiating Ministry, that the reason given by Christ is eternally valid in reference to all Labourers, that they deserve their Meat.

The Disciples of Christ being thus taught by their great Master, forsaking their livelihoods and earthly Possessions, presumed upon the goodness of God, who would not so have sent them abroad, but that he would dispose the Hearts of Men accordingly in order to their subsistence: So they relied

relied upon their Converts for necessary supplies, and received the Benevolence of several Pious Women, who ministered unto them. For so saith Paul, Have not I Power to lead about with me a Woman, a Sister, as do the other Apostles, and the Brethren of our Lord, and Cephas? 1 Cor. 9. 5. And he at large sheweth how they who sow Spirituals, ought to reap Temporal Sustenance of the People; and faith, it is the appointment of the Lord, that they who Preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel, 1 Cor. 9. 14. They ^{Prosper de vita contem.} faith Prosper, do live of the Gospel, who ^{pl. l. 2.c.14.} will be Proprietors of nothing, who ^{in concil. A-} neither have, nor desire to have any thing, ^{quisgran. s.} not possessing their own, but the common Goods. What is it to live of the Gospel, but that he who Labours should receive necessary supplies, by them amongst whom he Labours? Though Paul himself would not make use of his Permission, lest he should create Offence; but he laboured with his hands, being a Tent-maker, and so got his living, Act. 18. 3. & 1 Cor. 4. 12. By these voluntary Contributions were the Apostles sustained, and such others as laboured in the Gospel. Cyril of Alexandria, descanting upon that passage of Abraham, Gen. 14. 23. who after he had gained a Victory over the Enemies of the King of Sodom, and rescued him, together with his Confederates and Lot, when the said King offered him part of the Spoils, he ^{Cyril de a-} dorat in ^{Spir. & ver.} would receive nothing but a few Victuals: ^{l.4.ad finem.} From thence doth Cyril take occasion excellent-
ly

ly to shew what doth become the Ministers of Christ. ‘ Though, saith he, the holy Teachers do War in the behalf of perishing Mankind, though they undergo an infinity of Pains, yet do not they take any thing from the Men of the World, nor do they heap up to themselves Riches, whereby they decline that invidious expostion, to which they would be else liable: Say not that I have enriched Abram. They only receive their Sustenance from the hands of those whom they have benefited: For the Labourer is worthy of his Hire: And it is Christ’s

Exode 10. 7. ‘ Command, that he who Teaches the Go-
z cor. 9.14. ‘ spel, should live thereby.

The Clergy then did not live by Tithes, nor did they demand any such thing; but as often as they met together, at least as often as they did break bread together, Collections were made (some resemblance whereof there is in the vulgar Communion or Sacrament-receiving) and out of those voluntary Oblations were the Clergy maintained, Sick, Poor, Strangers, Prisoners, Widows, Orphans, and all indigent Persons supplyed. Those Collections were not so enforced, as that any Man could not refuse them: Every one, saith Tertullian, once in a Month, or as he pleaseth, or is able, doth give his Alms; for none is compelled, but each gives of his own accord. And after the monthly Allotment of the Officiating Clergy, and other Charitable Works were defrayed; the remaining Sum was de-

Tertull. in
Apoloq. c.
39.

deposited in a Chest, for help of the Poor, upon any Emergency, as the aforesaid Tertullian doth tell us: So that how Bountiful soever the first Christians were for some Centuries (and indeed they were so liberal, that all things were common, as it were, to the fraternity) yet did the Clergy advantage themselves no further thereby, than that they were supplyed with Food, Rayment, and what else their necessities did require; Sobriety and Temperance were their Possession, being so far from growing Rich, that they thought all manner of Opulence mis-becoming a Clergy-man.

A Rich Priest by Origen is compared to those of Pharaoh, Gen. 47. 22. And the comparison is by him thus managed, "It is said that the Land of the Priests in Egypt was not brought into Pharaoh's Possession, nor did they sell themselves with the other Egyptians, but they were sustainted *Gratis*, either by the munificence of Pharaoh, or Joseph, and by reason of such their familiarity with the King, they did not vary their condition; but continued their Possession; and it is said unto them, which Christ saith to those that are Believers, *I call you not now Servants, but Friends.* In fine, Would you know what is the difference betwixt the Priests of God, and the Priests of Pharaoh? Pharaoh gives his Priests Lands on Earth, the Lord doth not give any Portion unto his in the Land; but he tells them, *I am your Portion.* Mark then all you

John 15.15.
Genes. hist. mill. 16.

you, who read this, ye Priests of the Lord, and see what difference there is betwixt Priest and Priest, lest that they who have a Portion in the Land, and are taken up with earthly Cares and Studies, be not found the Priests of the Lord, but of Pharaoh; for it is he who allows his Priests a Possession in the Land, and to Cultivate the Earth, and not their Minds, and to Busie themselves in their Farmes, and not in the Law. But let us hear what Christ hath commanded his Disciples, *He who forsaketh not all his Possessions for my sake, cannot be my Disciple.*

Luke 14. 33.

I tremble at these Words, for I first of all, I my self become my own accuser, and pronounce my own Condemnation. Christ denieth him to be his Disciple, whom he sees to retain any Possessions, and who doth not forgoe all things; and what do we do? How do we read these things, or how do we explain them to the People, who are so far from renouncing what we now possess, that we strive to make new Purchases of what we had not before we came to Christ? What then? Shall we conceal those things that are written, or pass them over in Silence, because that our Conscience chargeth us with the neglect of them? No, I will not be doubly Criminal: I confess that all this is written, although I know that I have not fulfilled it. But taking warning from hence, let us make haste

haste to fulfill it, let us make haste to pass
 from amongst the Number of Pharaoh's
 Priests, who have Possessions in the Land,
 unto those of God, who have no earthly
 Possessions, but whose Portion is the
 Lord. For even such was he who did
 say, *As Poor, yet making others Rich; as*
^{2 Cor. 6. 10.} *having nothing, yet possessing all things.* It
 is Paul, who doth thus boast. Will you
 hear what Peter saith of himself? Hear
 what he says concerning himself and
 John also, *Silver and Gold have I none.* ^{Act. 3. 6.}

Behold the Riches of those who are
 Priests to Christ, and behold what it is
 that they below, who have nothing!
 Such Riches are not the result of earthly
 Possessions. The same Origen saith else-
 where, *But let us quickly apply these*
<sup>Origen how
mil. 15. in
Levit.</sup> *things to ourselves, who are prohibited*
by the Law of Christ, if we have any
regard therunto, to have Possessions in
the Country, or Houses in City; What
do I say? Possessions! Houses! No, not
to multiply Coats, or Money. If we
have Food and Rayment, let us be con-
tent. These are the Professions of that
eminent Man, Origen, who acknowledgeth
it to be his Sin, and trembles at the breach
of Christ's Commandment; that he being
a Clergy-man, should still retain his Patri-
^{Eccles. 12. v. 2.} *trimony. Nor is this the single Declara-*
tion of one superstitious Man; It was
the Judgment and Practice of the Church
for many Years after his Decease. Hierome
^{2 Cor. 10. 10.} *doth*

doth much extol the Poverty of the Clergy.
Hier. sp. 2. ad Nepotianum.

As a Levite, and Priest, saith he, do I live of the Tents, and serving at the Altar, I am supplyed by the Oblations of the Altar; having Food, having Clothes, I will be content therewith, and naked follow the naked Cross. I beseech you (he writes to *Nepotianus* a Clergy-man) and by a redoubled enforcement warn you, that you would not transform our Spiritual Warfare into a Carnal One, nor imagine your self in the Clergy, as if you were in an Army; look not for Spoils in these Conflicts, nor yet more than you brought with you, when you came first to the Clergy; lest it be said to you, their Lot shall not profit them.

[Cleri corum non prouiduntur] Hieron. 12.

3. The said Ferom doth much exagerate this, because it was both the Custom and Constitution of those times, that no he but the Poor shall be admitted to the Clergy; and if any Rich Man would take Orders, he was to quit his Riches, and forsake his Patrimony. Speaking how the Apostles designed a Bishop to be; he, amongst other things, saith, 'A Bishop, who desires to be an imitator of the Apostles, having Food and Rayment, must be content therewith. Let them that serve at the Altar, live by the Altar: He doth not say, Let them grow Rich thereby. Wherefore we are interdicted Money in our Purses, and to wear but one Coat, nor to think of

Hier. in ep. ad Tit. c. 1.

x Cor. 9.13.

Matth. 10.9.

mod

to Morrow: It is a desire of filthy
 Lucre, even to think of more than
 the present. *Possidius* writes it in the
Life of Austin, c. 12. He was always
 mindful of the Poor, and relieved them
 out of that Maintenance whereby he
 and his were sustained, that is, either
 out of the Revenues of the Church,
 or the Oblations of the Faithful. And
 when, as it usually happens, any did
 envy the Clergy for their Possessions; he
 told the People, that he had rather live
 by Church-Collections, than be troubled
 with the management of those Posses-
 sions; And that he was ready to give
 Them up, that so all the Servants of God,
 and Ministers, might live, as they in the
Old Testament, *Serving at the Altar*, and
 participating thereof. But the Laity
 would never permit this. *Chrysostom hom.*
 15. in *Tim.* avoweth it boldly, that the
 Rulers of the Church ought to have no-
 thing but Food and Rayment. *In the fourth*
Council of Carthage, c. 51, 52, 53. *it is or-*
dashed, "Let every Clergy-man get his
 livelihood by some Artifice, or Hushan-
 dry, without prejudice to his Calling.
 And let every Clergy-man, tho' learn-
 ed in the Word of God, have some Ar-
 tifice, or Handy-Craft. And let all Clergy-
 men that are able to Labour, learn some
 petty Handy-Crafts.

And thus I have given a brief account,
 of what he at large proveth: In which

Book, the Reader may satisfie himself concerning, nor only the Maintenance of the Ministry, but the Propriety they have in their Goods and Possessions, arising to them, as they are of the Clergy. If it be said by Q.

This is proved by Dr. Heylin, in his certain epist. against Baxter; & by a nameless, yet sober and learned writer in the time of Q. Eliz. in a Book called *An abstract of Laws and Canons, &c. in force.*

Elizabeth (as I shew hereafter) that the Goods of the Church, are the Goods of the Poor: It is from this Bishop you may see it proved, they are not Proprietors, nor do I know by what Laws they claim a Property, as Free-holders, being but Stewards for the Church, incapable of making a Legacy, much less of keeping a House, of defrauding the poor Alms-men and Tenants of their wonted Reception, that so they may grow Rich, and ride in Coaches. (as the Canons of Ch. Ch. in Oxon.) for which a Stewardship I know not any Law in Force in the Ecclesiastical Laws, where they interfere not with the English Supremacy, are in force against them, I think, they being a part of the National Law; if they are (as Albertus Crantzus, l. 3. c. 15. said heretofore of the Secular Canons) Monstre sine Exemplo, Regulares sine Regula, Canonici sine Canone. Monsters without Example, Regulars without any Rule, Canons without any Laws.

F. N. I. S.

Book

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, in
White-Hart-Court in Gracious-Street, and
at the Bible in Leaden-Hall-Street, 1699.

TRUTH'S PRINCIPLES: OR, THOSE THINGS about DOCTRINE and WORSHIP which are most surely believed and received amongst the People of God, called Quakers, viz. Concerning the Man Christ, His Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Faith in his Blood, the Imputation of his Righteousness, Sanctification, Justification, &c. by John Creek. To which is added, somewhat concerning the Difference between the Persuasions of Reason, and the Persuasions of Faith. By Isaac Penington, price stich'd 3/-

A DEFENCE OF A PAPER, ENTITLED, GOSPEL TRUTH; AGAINST THE EXCEPTIONS OF THE BISHOP OF CORK'S TESTIMONY. (AGAINST THE QUAKERS.) BY W. PENN, PRICE BOUND 12/-

Angus Flagellatum: OR, A SWITCH FOR THE SNAKE. BEING AN ANSWER TO THE THIRD AND LAST EDITION OF THE SNAKE IN THE GRAVE. WHEREIN THAT AUTHOR'S INJUSTICE AND FALSEHOOD, BOTH IN QUOTATION AND STORY, ARE DISCOVERED AND OBFUSCATED. AND THE TRUTH DOCTRINALLY DELIVERED BY US, STATED AND MAINTAINED IN OPPOSITION TO HIS MIFYREPRESENTATION AND PERVERSION. BY JOSEPH WYATT. TO WHICH IS ADDED A SUPPLEMENT BY GEORGE WHITFIELD.

THE CHRISTIAN QUAKER AND HIS DIVINE TESTIMONY DATED AND VINDICATED, FROM SCRIPTURE, REASON AND AUTHORITY. BY W. PENN. PRICE BOUND 12/-

ENGLAND'S PRESENT INTEREST CONSIDERED, WITH HONOUR TO THE PRINCE, AND SAFETY TO THE PEOPLE. IN ANSWER TO THIS ONE QUESTION, WHAT IT WOULD BE BEST AND SAFEST TO DO, FOR ALLAYING THE HEAT OF

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowle.

contrary Interests, and making them sufficient with the
Prosperity of the Kingdom? Submitted to the Consideration of our Superiors. By W. Penn, price
Bound £1.

The Tryal of Spirits both in Teachers and Hearers. Wherein is held forth the clear Discovery and certain Downfall of the Carnal and Anti-christian Clergy of these Nations. Testified from the Word of God to the University Congregations in Cambridge. Whereunto is added, a plain and necessary Confutation of divers Gross Errors delivered by Mr. Sydrates Simpson, in a Sermon preached to the same Congregation at the Commencement, Anno MDCLIII. Wherein (among other things) is declared, that the Universities (according to their present Statutes and Practices) are not (as he affirmed) answerable to the Schools of the Prophets in the time of the Law; but rather to the Idolatrous High Places. And that Human Learning is not a Preparation appointed by Christ, either for the right Understanding or right Teaching the Gospel. With a brief Testimony against Divinity Degrees in the Universities. As also Luther's Testimony at large upon the whole Matter. And lastly, The right Reformation of Learning, Schools, and Universities, according to the State of the Gospel, and the Light that shines therein. All necessary for the Instruction and Direction of the Faithful in these last times. By William Dell, Minister of the Gospel, and Master of the Royal and Cambric College in Cambridge. price Bound £1. 6 d.

THE Defence of the People called Quakers. Being a Reply to a Book lately Published by certain Priests of the County of Norfolk, under the pretended Title of The Quakers' Chariot. And con-

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Scovell.

containing some brief and modest Animadversions upon the Book it self. Several Certificates, which Detect the Errors in those of *West-Direbam*, and Clear the People called *Quakers* of the said Challenge. The Letters that passed between Them and the Priests. price Sixch'd 12*s*.
The True Light owned and vindicated, and the Believers in it defended. And Blasphemy and Blasphemers justice Decreed upon price Sixch'd 2*d*.
An Apology for the People called *Quakers*, and an Appeal to the Inhabitants of Norfolk and Suffolk, or Whom else it may concern. price Sixch'd 2*d*.
An Apostle's Conscience Exposed, and the Miserable Consequences thereof disclosed, for Information and Caution. By Wm. Dec 19*a*. price Sixch'd 4*d*. Issued from the booksellor's shop
An Abridgment of *Eusebius Pamphilus's Ecclesiastical History*, in two Parts; Part I. A Compendious Commemoration of the Remarkablest Chronologies which are contained in that Famous History. Part II. A summary or brief Hint of the Twelve Persecutions sustained by the Antient Christians, with a Compendious Paraphrase upon the same: Whereunto is added, a Catalogue of the Synods and Councils, which were after the days of the Apostles; together with a Hint of what was Doctred in the same. By William C. A Testimony to the Truth of God, as held by the People called *Quakers*; Being a short Vindication of them, from the Abuses and Misrepresentations cast upon them by Envious Apostates, and Mercenary Adversaries. price Sixch'd 4*d*.

Truth and Innocency vindicated, and the People called *Quakers* Defended, in Principle and Practice, against Invidious Attempts and Calumny.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Bowle.

Being a just Examination of two Books against the said People; Entituled, vsl. A Brief Discourse, &c. by three Norfolk Priests, &c. Some few of the Quakers many horrid Blasphemies, &c. being a Scandalous Libel; Examined by George Whitehead a Servant of Christ: Containing also many of the repeated Abuses in John Meriton's Antidote, and Francis Bugg's Pilgrim's Progress. price 9 d.

The Friendly Enquirer's Doubts and Objections answered. Concerning The Light within, the Word of God, the Church of Christ, Gospel Ministers, Ordinances in General and in Particular, Water-Baptism and the Lord's Supper: Together with a Brief Testimony against Oaths and Tithes. First intended and written for the Satisfaction of some particular Acquaintance; and now published for more General Service. By James Jackson. price Bound 6 d.

Essays about the Poor, Manufactures, Trade Plantations and Immorality, and of the Excellency and Divinity of Inward Light; demonstrated from the Attributes of God, and the Nature of Man's Soul, as well as from the Testimony of Holy Scriptures. By John Bellers. price Stitch'd 4 d.

Exhibition. Containing Maxims Divine and Moral. price Bound 9 d.

The Works of that Memorable and Ancient Servant of Christ, Stephen Crisp; containing also a Journal of his Life, giving an Account of his Convincement, Travels, Labours and Sufferings in and for the Truth. Price Bound 9 d.

The Memory of the Righteous Revived, being a brief Collection of the Books and written Epistles of John Cotton and John Andland: Together with several Testimonies relating to those two Faithful Labourers. Price Bound 2 s.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Bowles

b Baptists and the Lord's Supper, Substantially Asserted; being an Apology in behalf of the People called Quakers, concerning those Two Heads. By Robert Barnes. Price Bound 12s. 6d. 1710.

A Garschism and Confession of Faith, By W. Boreley. Price Bound 9d. 1710.

No Cross, No Crown: A Discourse showing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ. By W. Penn. In Two Parts. The Fifth Edition. Price Bound 3s. 6d. 1710.

An Account of W^m Penn's Travels in Holland and Germany, for the Service of the Gospel of Christ by way of Journal. Containing also divers Letters and Epistles written severall Great and Eminent Persons whilst there. The Second Impression. Corrected by the Author's own Copy, with some Answers not before Printed. Price Bound 2s. 6d. 1710.

A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers, in which their Fundamental Principle, Doctrines, Worship, Ministry and Discipline are plainly Declared, to prevent the Mistakes and Perversions that Ignorance and Prejudice may make to abuse the Credulous. With a Summary Relation of the former Discourses of God in the World, by way of Introduction. By W. Penn. Price Bound 12s. 6d. 1710.

The Harmony of Divine and Heavenly Doctrines Demonstrated in sundry Declarations on Variety of Subjects. Preached at the Quakers Meetings in London, by Mr. W. Penn, Mr. G. Whitehead, Mr. S. Wallerfield, Mr. B. Cook, Taken in Short-hand as it was delivered by them, and now Faithfully Transcribed and Published for the Information of those who by reason of Ignorance may have received a Prejudice against them. By

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowell

A Letter of that People. b Price Bound 1s 8 d.
Primitive Christianity Revivell, sing the Faith and
Practice of the People called Quakers. Whiston
in Testimony to the present Dispensation of God
through them to the World, so That Prejudices
may be Removed, the Simple Informed, the Well-
inclined Encouraged, and the Truth and its In-
nocent Friends Rightly Represented. By W. Penn
Price Bound 1s 4 d. or 1s 6 d.

A Diurnal Speculum; containing, I. A plain
and easie Method To find out those things that are
most useful to be known Yearly; and may serve
as an Almanack for Thirty Years; and many other
things suitable to the Maner; & Anno Baptis-
ation of Weights, Money, and Measures; both
Scriptural and Usual; with sundry Tables depend-
ing thereon. II. Some Remarks on England;
or a Brief Account of every County, with the
Names, and Days of the Markets, and the Chief
Commodities therein, &c. The whole consisting
of great Variety, explained by divers Examples;
the like in all particulars not extant; as by the
Gentleman does more at large appear. Collected
by J. B. Price Bound 1s. 6 d. or 1s 8 d.

The Arraignment of Popery; being a Collection
taken out of the Chronicle and other Books of
the State of the Church in the Primitive Times
I. The State of the Papacy, how long it was be-
fore the Universal POPE and MASS was set up;
and the bringing in their Rudiments, Traditions,
Beads, Images, Purgatories, Tythes and Inquisi-
tions. II. A Relation of the Cruelties they acted
after the Pope got up, being worse than the Turk
and Saracen: Now Rome printing like Gibellini.
What the People of England Worshipped before
they were Christians. Viz To which is added
the

BOOKS. Printed and Sold by T. Sonnenschein.

the Blood of the Martyrs is the Seed of the Church.
With several other things, very profitable for all
that seek God to Read. Try and give Judgment by
the Spirit of Truth, against the Worship of the Beast
and Whore. Price Bound 15*s*.*d*, which buy:

An Invitation from the Spirit of Christ, to all that are a Thirst, to come and Drink of the Waters of Life freely, which proceed from the Fountain of Eternal Life: Shewing how all may come, that are willing, to Drink thereof to their full Satisfaction; whereby they may attain unto perfect Health and Salvation of their Souls for ever in the Lord Jesus Christ. And also, shewing what it is that hindereth People from being truly a Thirst after the Waters of Life; and from coming to Drink thereof, with the destructive Quality of that which hindered; and how it may be avoided. Concluded with a word to all Singers, upon a Religious or Spiritual Account. Written by one, who hath for a long time been deeply distressed with Thirst after the Water of Life; but, through Mercy, hath Obtained Satisfaction thereby: Known by the Name of *Henry Mellineux*. Price Bound 1 s.

Spiritu Respiration; or the Way to the Kingdom of Heaven, by the Gates of Hell, in an Extraordinary Example, By a Person brought to the depths of Despair and Anguish, recovered by the Mighty Grace and Power of God, and raised to the heights of Assurance and Joy. Wherein are some uncommon Considerations concerning the manner of Salvation and Damnation, Life and Death, Happiness and Misery. With some Fundamental Arguments for the Immortality of the Soul; Prince Rupert d. & Archib. 1712. Printed to assist in

BOOKS. Printed and Sold by T. SODD.

A NEW Query relating to the Practice of Physick; with Remarks upon some of them. Modelled
by proposal to the serious Consideration of Man-
kind, in order to their Information how their Lives
and Healths (which are so necessary, and there-
fore ought to be dear to them) may be better pre-
served. By H. Chamberlin, Physician in Ordinary
to the Late King Charles the Second. price Bound
£1.00 v. in its wod go wds. All bound to nine
-CHRIST'S SPIRIT & CHRISTIAN'S STRENGTH: Or, a plain
Dictionary of the Almighty and Invincible Power
that all Believers receive through the Gift of the
Spirit. Published forth on two Sermons, on ACTS.
16. and after published for the Instruction and Use
of those that are Spiritual. June 1635. by William
THEY: MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST. price
Bound 6 d. v. in its wod go wds. All bound to nine
-TRUTH'S INNOCENCY AND SIMPLICITY SHINING, thro'
all Conversion, Gospel-Ministry, Labours, Epistles
and Love. Testimonies and Warnings to Professors
and Profane (with the long and Patient Suffer-
ings) of that Ancient and Faithful Minister and
Servant of Jesus Christ, THOMAS TAYLOR. price
Bound 5 s.

A NEW Discourse of Trade, wherein is Recom-
mended several weighty Points relating to the
Commerce of Mankind, the Art of Navigation,
Manufacture of Strength, and our Woollen Ma-
nufacture; the Balance of Trade, and the Na-
tive Improvements, and their Confection in
the Colonies, are seriously considered; and
some Proposals are made to the Court of Mer-
chants for beginning Consideration, and also
to the House of Commons. And Proposals for the Settlement
of Bills of Debts, are humbly Offered. By Sir
Josiah Child. price Bound 3 s.

